

rd June 4  
st Feb 15  
rd June 4  
urt. Pet  
5 Apr 23.  
art. Pet  
nd. Pet  
t May 13.  
by. Pet  
t May 5.  
22. Ori  
Pet June  
31. Ori  
on Tye.  
Pet June  
st June 1.  
14. Ori  
k. High  
May 13.  
ton. Pet  
Pet Apr  
17. Ori  
e 3. Ori  
r 19. Ori  
dmontan.  
e 4. Ori  
actura.  
Countre.  
cludu  
Volu  
egularity  
ect to th  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

# The Solicitors Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 19, 1886.

## CURRENT TOPICS.

WE UNDERSTAND that Mr. THOMAS ANSDALL ROMER, solicitor, of 3, Furnival's-inn, has been appointed chief clerk to Mr. Justice KAY, in succession to Mr. R. W. PEAKE, resigned. Mr. ROMER was admitted in 1873.

THE APPEALS set down to be heard in the Trinity Sittings consist of 72 final and 13 interlocutory appeals from the Chancery Division; 6 appeals from the Chancery of the County Palatine of Lancaster; 60 final and 22 interlocutory appeals from the Queen's Bench Division; 2 final appeals from the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division; and 3 Bankruptcy appeals. These make a total of 178 appeals, as compared with 184 at the beginning of the last sittings, and 300 a year ago.

THE LISTS of causes and matters before the Chancery Judges shew a considerable increase upon those of recent occasions. Vice-Chancellor BACON has 126 causes and matters; Mr. Justice KAY, 155; Mr. Justice CHITTY, 141; Mr. Justice NORTH, 167; and Mr. Justice STIRLING, 121; making a total of 710. At the beginning of the Easter Sittings the total was 669, and at Trinity, 1885, 667.

THE CAUSE LISTS for the whole of the Supreme Court were not ready at the time of our going to press; nor were even the lists for the Chancery Division published at that time. No doubt allowance should be made for the cessation of work during the Whitsuntide holidays, but we think that the profession ought to obtain the lists a longer time before the commencement of the sittings than is likely to be the case on the present occasion. We give elsewhere the first twenty-five causes standing in Mr. Justice STIRLING's list. It would be misleading, before the whole lists are ready, to give a portion of the causes before the other judges of the Chancery Division.

THE DEATH is announced of Sir GEORGE KELLNER, K.C.M.G., her Majesty's Paymaster-General of the Supreme Court of Judicature, to which office he was appointed in the month of February, 1884. The late Paymaster was absent from illness for several months, and the duties of the office have, during that period, been performed by Mr. SKINNER, the Assistant-Paymaster. Sir GEORGE KELLNER came to his office with a high reputation for administrative capacity, and, during his short tenure, the department, which was reconstituted at the time of his appointment, has, under his guidance, carried out the Supreme Court Funds Rules, 1884, with very little friction between the profession and the officials. Better testimony could hardly be afforded to the efficiency of the chief officer.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S Revising Barristers Bill, which it will be necessary to pass before the dissolution of Parliament, repeats, with slight alterations, the Revising Barristers Act, 1885 (48 & 49 Vict. c. 57), which only continued in force until the end of the summer circuit in 1885, and section 29 of the Redistribution of Seats Act, 1885 (48 & 49 Vict. c. 23), which, with other sections contained in Part IV. of that Act and directed to the "acceleration of registration," applied to the year 1885 only. It is proposed by the Bill "that the senior judge named in the commission of

assize for the counties within any circuit, who actually travels that circuit or any part thereof during the summer circuit, or such other judge, if any, as may be arranged by the judges going the summer circuit," (the words italicized are new) "shall be the judge having power to appoint" the revising barristers. Unless this provision should pass, the power of appointment, would, by virtue of section 28 of the Parliamentary Registration Act, 1843, be vested in the Lord Chief Justice of England as senior judge in the commission of assize as made out under the 12th section of the Circuits Order of June, 1884. Another clause of the Bill, repeating section 29 of the Redistribution of Seats Act, 1885, provides that "if, at any time after the 5th September, it appear to a Secretary of State" [this official is substituted for a judge of the High Court] that the number "of revising barristers is insufficient, he may signify the same to any judge of the High Court sitting in chambers," and "thereupon such judge shall appoint such number of duly qualified barristers as are specified in such notice" to act as additional revisers. The appointments are, as was the case last year, to be for all the counties and boroughs on each circuit. The number of revising barristers to be appointed on circuit still remains to be fixed by Order in Council, under the Revising Barristers Act, 1873 (36 & 37 Vict. c. 70); the order issued on July 9, 1885, having applied to 1885 only. By that order the number, which was fixed at seventy-nine under the order of the 27th of June, 1876, was raised to 123. Perhaps a number half way between these two may be fixed by the forthcoming order.

A CORRESPONDENT recently raised the curious question, "To whom do the ballot-boxes, after a Parliamentary election, belong?" alleging that there are three classes of persons who lay claim to them—viz., "the candidates, the sheriff, and the under-sheriff." The statutes are silent upon the point. By section 8 of the Ballot Act, "Every returning officer shall provide such nomination papers, . . . ballot-boxes, . . . and other things as may be necessary for effectually conducting an election in manner provided" by the Act. By the schedule to the Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Act, 1875, the maximum charge to be paid by the candidates "for each ballot-box required to be purchased" is one guinea, and "for the use of each ballot-box, when hired," five shillings. It seems to us that, as a matter of law, the returning officer is merely the agent of the candidates to purchase ballot-boxes, so that the property in the boxes vests in them immediately on purchase, subject to the right of the returning officer to use them for the purpose of the election. We cannot see any legal basis for the so-called "perquisite" of the under-sheriff or other officer, and we do not obtain any satisfactory information as to the general existence of a custom to allow such perquisite. Perhaps, however, our readers may be able to afford information on this point. The question is of increasing importance now that it is proposed to cut down the charges of returning officers. Possibly the raising of the question will bring the hire of ballot-boxes more into vogue. In boroughs the municipal boxes may, by section 14 of the Ballot Act, "be used free of charge, and any damage, other than reasonable wear and tear caused to the same, shall be paid as part of the expenses of the election at which they are so used"; and by section 6 of the Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Act, 1875, it is made "the duty of the returning officer, so far as is practicable," to make use of such ballot-boxes.

THE PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS Returning Officers Act (1875) Amendment Bill was originally a comparatively unimportant measure introduced by Mr. HEALY and Mr. CHANCE for the simple purpose of allowing appeals from county court taxation of returning officers' charges under section 4 of the Act of 1875, but if

the amendments proposed in committee should become law, it will become a measure of great constitutional and practical consequence to candidates, ratepayers, and returning officers. It is proposed that in counties in England the returning officer's charges "shall be paid out of the county rates, and the justices of the peace for each county shall be empowered to, and shall, make provision for the same"; that in boroughs such charges shall be payable out of the borough fund; and that, "in the case of any municipal borough the area of which is exempt from the payment of county rates, and which is not under this Act required to pay or contribute to such charges, such municipal borough shall contribute to the payment of such charges for the county, counties, or parliamentary divisions of a county, within which it is in whole or in part situate." There is as yet no proposal for casting on a candidate who fails to obtain a certain proportion of votes the proportion of expenses caused by his candidature, but some such amendment seems to be reasonable, and will probably be moved. With regard to the charges to be made, and the security which may be demanded by returning officers, very extensive changes are proposed, the first and third schedules of the Act of 1875 being entirely repealed and replaced by new scales. The distinction made by the Act of 1875 between county and borough elections is to be entirely done away with. A new distinction is drawn between contested and uncontested elections (which new distinction appears to be reasonable and proper), and specific charges are to be considerably cut down. Ballot-boxes, for instance, are to be charged for at not more than ten shillings apiece, instead of a guinea. But perhaps the greatest alteration will be in the amount of security which may be required from candidates. The Act of 1875 contains an elaborate schedule authorizing amounts ranging from one thousand pounds to one hundred. It is now proposed that the maximum is to be, in the case of contested elections, two hundred pounds, and in the case of uncontested elections, ten pounds. It may, perhaps, be doubted whether the House of Lords will sanction all these proposals, and it is to be hoped that the legitimate claims of the returning officers, whose charges are, by the first schedule of the Act of 1875, "in no case to exceed the sums actually and necessarily paid or payable," will be duly supported in that House.

THE APPEAL by Sir CHARLES DILKE from the decision of Sir JAMES HANNEN in the *Crawford-Dilke* case will settle an interesting question on the practice as to intervention by the Queen's Proctor—viz., whether such intervention is to be virtually equivalent to a new trial. It is not necessary to speculate on the result of the appeal, but we may point out that the practice as to intervention is, to some extent, an excrescence upon the original statute (20 & 21 Vict. c. 85) by which the Court of Divorce was established. The Matrimonial Causes Act, 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 145), first provided that every decree for a divorce should, "in the first instance, be a decree nisi, not to be made absolute till after the expiration of such time, not less than three months from the pronouncing thereof," as the court should direct, and this interval was extended to six months by the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1866 (29 & 30 Vict. c. 32), s. 3. Section 7 of the former Act then goes on to enable any person, within the specified period, "to shew cause why the said decree should not be made absolute by reason of the same having been obtained by collusion or by reason of material facts not brought before the court" and on cause being thus shewn, the court may make the decree nisi absolute, or reverse it, or require further inquiry, "as justice may require." Any person may, before the decree is made absolute, give information "of any matter material to the due decision of the case" to the Queen's Proctor, who may take such steps as the Attorney-General deems necessary or expedient, and if he suspects collusion he may intervene in the suit under the Attorney-General's direction and by leave of the court, in which case the Queen's Proctor's costs may be ordered to be paid by either of the parties. It will be seen that this last provision extends only to cases of collusion, and, therefore, it was held by the House of Lords in *Lautour v. Her Majesty's Proctor* (12 W. R. 611, 10 H. L. Cas. 685), that, if he intervened upon any ground other than that of collusion, the Queen's Proctor was only in the same position as one of the public giving information to the court, and costs could not be awarded to him. The distinction as to costs was removed by the Matrimonial Causes

Act, 1878 (41 & 42 Vict. c. 19), section 2 of which provides that, wherever there is an intervention or a shewing cause by the Queen's Proctor, or by any other person, the court may make such order as to the costs of the Queen's Proctor, or the intervenor, as shall seem just, and that the Queen's Proctor or intervenor may recover his costs in the same manner as in other cases.

## THE COUNTY COURT ACT'S CONSOLIDATION BILL.

AMID the political turmoil the County Court Acts Consolidation Bill is not likely to attract much public attention. The circumstances attending the birth of the Bill cannot be said to have been altogether auspicious, for it was introduced by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords on the very day that the Government was defeated in the House of Commons. It is greatly to be hoped, however, that, whatever may happen in the political world, this very useful piece of work may not be lost sight of. No one is likely to deny that a general consolidation of the county court statutes is extremely desirable. Between 1846 and 1882 there have been no less than eleven Acts dealing directly with county courts, to say nothing of the changes effected by the Judicature Acts, or of the numerous statutes which confer jurisdiction on county courts with regard to particular matters.

The Lord Chancellor's Bill, which consists of 189 sections, is entirely a consolidation Bill, and merely aims at reducing into order the provisions of all the statutes which deal with the jurisdiction and practice of county courts. At the same time, of course, all provisions which have become obsolete or superfluous have been omitted. The Bill, in fact, is interesting rather for what it does not, than for what it does, contain. For example, with regard to actions remitted from the High Court to the county court:—at present an action may be remitted in one of two ways. Under section 26 of the Act of 1856 (19 & 20 Vict. c. 108), where, in an action of contract brought in a superior court, the claim indorsed on the writ does not exceed £50, a judge of a superior court, on the application of either party, after issue joined, may order that the cause be tried in a county court; whilst under section 7 of the Act of 1867 (30 & 31 Vict. c. 142), where the claim does not exceed £50, the defendant, within eight days of the service of the writ, may apply to a judge at chambers for a summons to the plaintiff to shew cause why the action should not be tried in the county court. Section 85 of the Consolidation Bill combines these two sections, and provides as follows:— "Where, in any action of contract brought in the High Court, the claim indorsed on the writ does not exceed £50, or where such claim, though it originally exceeded £50, is reduced by payment admitted, set off, or otherwise to a sum not exceeding £50, it shall be lawful for either party to the action at any time, if the whole or part of the demand of the plaintiff be contested, to apply to a judge of the High Court at chambers to order such action to be tried in any court in which the action might have been commenced, or in any court convenient thereto; and, on the hearing of the application, the judge shall, unless there is good cause to the contrary, order such action to be tried accordingly." The remainder of the section is a reproduction of the latter part of section 7 of the Act of 1867.

With regard to appeals, sections 14 and 15 of the Act of 1850 (13 & 14 Vict. c. 61), which respectively give to parties aggrieved the right of appeal, and provide that the appeal shall be in the form of a case agreed on, are combined with section 6 of the Act of 1875, which provides for appeal by motion. The appeal section (section 119) of the Consolidation Bill runs as follows:— "If any party in any action or proceeding for an amount exceeding £20 shall be dissatisfied with the determination or direction of the court in point of law, or upon the admission or rejection of any evidence, the party may appeal from the same to the High Court, or if the High Court be not then sitting, to a judge thereof in chambers, in such manner and subject to such conditions as may be for the time being provided by the rules of the Supreme Court regulating the procedure on appeals from inferior courts to the High Court; and the High Court may either order a new trial on such terms as it shall think fit, or may order judgment to be entered for either party, as the case may be, or may make any order on such terms as the High Court may think



proper to insure the determination on the merits of the real questions in controversy between the parties." The remainder of the section, with regard to the taking of a note by the judge, is a reproduction of the latter part of section 6 of the Act of 1875. It will be observed that the important words in section 14 of the Act of 1850, enacting that the order of the superior court, on appeal from the county court, shall be final, are not contained in the appeal section of the Consolidation Bill. This is in conformity with the decision in *Crush v. Turner* (L. R. 3 Ex. D. 303), where the Court of Appeal held that section 20 of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, did not revive the provision of the County Court Act, 1850, as to the finality of the orders of the superior court, and that that provision had been impliedly repealed by section 45 of the Judicature Act, 1873. Accordingly the present practice of appeal by leave to the Court of Appeal will remain unaffected.

Section 119 of the Consolidation Bill would have the effect of removing all doubts as to whether or not the Rules of the Supreme Court of December, 1885 (LIX., 9—17), which supersede the practice of appealing by special case and substitute a uniform practice by notice of motion, are *ultra vires*.

With regard to the question as to whether or not the Rules of December, 1885, apply to actions remitted to the county court for trial under the Act of 1856, the combined effect of section 119 of the Consolidation Bill and of R. S. C., 1883, LIX., 9—17 (if not the effect of the latter alone), would certainly seem to be to render the practice uniform in all cases and finally do away with rules *nisi*. As to this point, it may well be contended that, if the action is remitted for all purposes to the county court, under the Act of 1867, the procedure on appeal is governed by the Rules of 1885, whereas, if it is remitted only for trial under the Act of 1856, and still remains, for other purposes, in the High Court, the procedure on applications for new trials is governed by the Rules of 1883. Whether this contention be correct or not, it is, of course, impossible to reconcile it with the decision in *Pritchard v. Pritchard* (L. R. 14 Q. B. D. 55).

As a mere question of arrangement, the division of the Bill into sub-headings would be a great improvement. To find what you want in a Bill of 189 sections is no easy matter. There is no reason why the Bill should not be divided into parts, even if that involved the re-arrangement of some of the sections.

## THE EVIDENCE TAKEN BY THE CHANCERY CHAMBERS COMMITTEE.

### II.

WE next come to the question of the abolition of the several offices of registrar and taxing master, and transferring the duties of those offices to the chief clerks. As previously remarked, the members of the committee appear to entertain the idea that it will be convenient to transfer to the chief clerks the duties performed by these offices. The first witness examined on this subject (Mr. Clarke, the chief clerk) considers (186) that there would be no saving, but quite the contrary, if the chief clerks—supposing they were competent—were to do the taxing themselves. As regards the registrars, he says (193—5), in all orders made on proceedings in chambers the materials are supplied by the chief clerk and the form is supplied by the registrar; this is necessary in all orders that are to be acted on by the Paymaster-General, because he will not act upon the chief clerk's order, it must be the registrar's order. Therefore, when you deal with funds in court, it must be the registrar's order. This does not lead to reduplication of work, because the chief clerk's note for the order may be about twenty words and the order may be about fifty folios. He does not think (196) it would conduce to economy or efficiency if the registrars' and the chief clerks' establishments were combined. The registrars have to attend in court, and such attendance would entirely interrupt the chief clerk's work. If he had to do his day's work and go and sit in court and do the registrar's work afterwards, his business would get into arrears very rapidly.

Another chief clerk, Mr. Hawkins (625—8), thinks it would be inadvisable for the chief clerks to draw orders in chambers. "The registrars are a body of men trained up from their youth in orders. It may look, to an outsider, a curious thing that an order of the court should be a complicated matter, but I know few things that are more complicated. There is a great advantage in an order for payment out of court being drawn by the registrars, because they have the case before them, and it forms an additional safeguard against

any order being made irregularly or by an oversight. . . . I dare say that errors are made, but we are fortunate in having them discovered before they are completed by the care of the registrars. . . . It would take us (the chief clerks) about the same time to draw orders as it does the registrars." The next witness, Mr. Pemberton, the registrar, is an expert in drawing orders. He says (875) that it takes a long while to learn the work of a registrar accurately, and that, if a chief clerk were to attempt to draw up all the orders he pronounces, or to settle and draw up all orders pronounced by the court, he would have to get someone else to do his present work for him.

Mr. Hollams thinks that an advantage would be gained by amalgamating (973) the chief clerks with the registrars, but, in such a case, the under-staff (974) of the chief clerks must be increased. He does not think it absolutely essential (975) that the registrars should attend in court, although he appreciates the advantage (1169) of the registrar having his own note to work from, and though he finds the general opinion (1018) strongly against him. He also observes (975) that, if there were no registrars, there might be more chief clerks, and is of opinion (1126) that the work of the registrars might be done by any competent solicitor. He sees the advantage of a chief clerk drawing up his own orders (1200), but thinks (1197) they are fully occupied now, and he does not know (1198) whether the registrars are fully occupied.

It is Mr. Francis's impression (1264) that, if the registrars and chief clerks were amalgamated, as many chief clerks would be wanted as there now are, and all, or nearly all, the registrars; and he thinks (1265) the registrars should go into court. Moreover, he considers it an advantage (1266) to have a taxing officer distinct from a chief clerk, and that no substantial gain would be derived (1267) by amalgamating the chief clerks and taxing masters. As regards the taxing masters, he thinks (1436) something might be done to rectify the block in their office by a better classification of the work.

Mr. Rawle thinks that the registrar would be a proper officer to make (as distinguished from drawing up) some orders (1490), such as for payment out of court to an infant come of age; a result of the present system (1492) is that some of the work is done twice over.

Mr. Ryland thinks (1643) that, if the registrars are done away with, the chief clerks would be the best substitute, but he would not do away with the registrars. He thinks (1646) there is a great deal more work in chambers than the present staff can do expeditiously, and that, if the chief clerks are to do the work of the registrars and the taxing masters (1647), more chief clerks will be wanted; he would not, however, have the chief clerks draw (1730) orders made in court or money orders.

To this evidence must be added the remarks of Mr. Justice Pearson in his "objections." He says: "At present the registrars circulate in all the courts, including the Court of Appeal. In this way they obtain a wide experience of the practice, and are often able to assist a judge." If the clerks are to take the place of the present registrars, "I fear it will soon be found that the successors of the registrars have not the same special knowledge of the forms of the court which the present officers possess, and the judges will be embarrassed for want of the assistance which they now obtain." "As to the taxing masters. It is, in my judgment, a great advantage that the taxing masters are entirely separated from all matters in respect of which they have to tax bills of costs in their earlier stages. They are thus kept independent and impartial, and no solicitor need fear their being prejudiced by any opinion they have formed in the progress of the litigation."

The question of leading counsel attaching themselves to particular courts does not appear to have been within the competence of the committee to deal with. Nevertheless, evidence was taken on this subject which it may be of service to recapitulate, as it has a material bearing on the question whether each cause should be attached to a judge. On this subject Mr. Hollams thinks (997) it is an advantage that you should have the same counsel and the same judge in the further proceedings of a case as in its earlier stages. He does not (999), under present circumstances, think it an advantage to suitors that leading counsel should attach themselves to a particular court, because now (1000) you cannot choose your judge, and you are necessarily limited to the leading counsel in the court of the judge; you are tied to your leading counsel unless you can incur the expense of taking in another. Mr. Francis thinks (1308) that, although the present system carries with it the evil of occasionally sending over a witness cause, the breaking up of that system would be a greater evil. Mr. Rawle considers (1614) it very desirable that the practice should remain; "in fact, if it were not allowed, you would be very much in the same state of things as exists in the Queen's Bench Division; you would never be able to rely upon having your particular counsel in chancery actions which frequently come before the court at successive stages. It is very important to a suitor that he should be heard again by the same leading counsel that he had had on a previous occasion." Mr. Justice Chitty thinks (2130) the practice is advantageous to the suitor; "it is very rare to find any of my leading counsel away when an action is called on." When he was at the bar (2131), he thought it of the greatest advantage to the

sutor, and acted on that principle, and refused a retainer elsewhere. "The advantage of having the same counsel attending throughout a cause who knows what has gone on in witness or non-witness actions tends (2133) to the despatch of business."

In addition to the subjects already referred to, the committee received opinions from the solicitors attending from Liverpool and Manchester on the desirability of having a chancery judge to sit continuously at Liverpool or Manchester for the disposal of all chancery business for the counties of Cheshire and Lancashire. The estimate is that the chancery business of that portion of the country bears so large a proportion to the whole of the business of the Chancery Division that it would occupy the whole, or nearly the whole, time of one judge. They would not desire to have always the same judge, and suggest that a change should take place from time to time.

## REVIEWS.

### ADMIRALTY PRACTICE.

A TREATISE ON THE JURISDICTION AND PRACTICE OF THE ENGLISH COURTS IN ADMIRALTY ACTIONS AND APPEALS, BEING A SECOND EDITION OF WILLIAMS AND BRUCE'S ADMIRALTY PRACTICE. By GAINSFORD BRUCE, Q.C., assisted by CHARLES FUHR JEMMETT, Barrister-at-Law. W. Maxwell & Son.

This book was first published in 1868, just before a jurisdiction in admiralty had been conferred on county courts by the County Courts Admiralty Jurisdiction Act of that year. The county court practice under that Act; the consolidation of the Court of Admiralty with the Supreme Court by the Judicature Acts, and the Admiralty Rules, which form so comparatively large a portion of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883, have rendered a new edition absolutely necessary to admiralty practitioners, and we find that the book has been increased by nearly 300 pages. The statutes, rules, and cases are abstracted in the text, and the rules (but not, as in the first edition, the statutes) follow in the appendix, which also contains forms of decrees and of bills of costs, and the County Court Rules as to costs. The introduction, which is remarkably well composed, appears to have been re-written as well as expanded. The new rules (see e.g. at pp. 343 and 356) are criticized with independence and thoroughness, and the whole work bears the impress of care and knowledge of its subject. We may, perhaps, suggest that a fault somewhat noticeable in the first edition—the too great copiousness of annotation—has been intensified rather than diminished, as may be best exemplified by a reference to pp. 350, 351, which two pages have only one line of text apiece. The editors also cite the rules with double numbers as officially issued, which is unnecessary, and they have, in no case which we have been able to discover, given a reference to more than one set of reports.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### EX PARTE BLANCHETT, RE KEELING.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In answer to "A Subscriber's" letter in your last issue, the simplest course appears to be to bring an action on the judgment, and proceed under R. S. C., 1883, XIV., and after having obtained judgment, which would go as a matter of course, to proceed in the usual way.

It might also be that an assignee of a judgment debt, who has obtained leave to issue execution under R. S. C., 1883, XLII., 23, is a "judgment creditor" within sub-section 5 of section 103 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, and so entitled to take advantage of that sub-section.

A. E. ABRAHAMS.

8, Old Jewry, E.C., June 11.

The judicial business of the House of Lords will be resumed on Monday next, the 21st inst., at a quarter to eleven o'clock, when the cause of *Houston v. The Marquis of Stigo* will be in the paper for hearing.

It is stated that Mr. Alfred Morrough Bernard, a solicitor with an extensive connection and practice in Killarney, who attended the Derby and was known to have won a considerable amount of money, has not been heard of since he left his hotel in London to drive to Euston Station on the 31st ult. It is said that he was warned against certain suspicious characters who were noticed to be watching him. Mr. Bernard's friends fear he has been the object of foul play at the hands of betting men.

## CASES OF LAST WEEK.

### COURT OF APPEAL.

POOLEY v. WHETHAM—C. A. No. 2, 10th June.

APPEAL—SECURITY FOR COSTS—DELAY IN MAKING APPLICATION—R. S. C., 1883, LVIII., 15.

This was an application by a respondent for security for the costs of an appeal, and the objection was raised that the application was made too late. The action was brought by the trustee of a bankrupt to set aside a sale which had been made by a mortgagee of property of the bankrupt. The action was tried by Pearson, J., on the 23rd of February, 1886, and was dismissed, with costs. Notice of appeal was served by the plaintiff on one of the defendants, a company, on the 1st of March, and on the 22nd of May briefs were delivered to the appellant's counsel and the fees paid. At that time it was expected that the appeal would very soon come into the paper for hearing, but the hearing was delayed by the fact that some prior cases lasted a long time. On the 5th of June the company gave notice of motion, asking that the plaintiff might be ordered to give security for their costs of the appeal. The company proved that their costs of the action had been taxed at £664, the taxing master's certificate being dated the 26th of May; and that on the 31st of May their solicitors wrote to the plaintiff that, if the costs were not paid the next day, they should issue execution. The costs were not paid, and on the 1st of June a writ was issued to the sheriff, to which he made a return of *nulla bona*. It was also proved that bankruptcy proceedings had been commenced against the plaintiff by another of the defendants to the action, in respect of his taxed costs of the action, and that the plaintiff had admitted that he had not consulted the bankrupt's creditors as to the bringing of the appeal. Moreover, some of the members of the committee of inspection appointed in the bankruptcy had stated, that the committee had not given their approval to the bringing of the appeal. There were no available assets of the bankrupt. There was nothing to show that the company had no reasonable evidence of the plaintiff's insolvency until the return of *nulla bona* by the sheriff. The Court (COTTON, LINDLEY, and LOPES, L.J.J.) refused the application, on the ground that it had been made too late. They said that such an application ought to be made promptly, and ought not to be delayed until after the appellant had incurred the costs of the appeal, the briefs not having been delivered prematurely to his counsel. The result of the application might have been different if it had been proved that the respondents had no reasonable evidence of the plaintiff's insolvency before the return of *nulla bona*.—COUNSEL, *Grosvenor Woods*; *Sidney Woolf*. SOLICITORS, *Snell, Son, & Greenip*; *Harper & Batesek*.

HOWARTH v. HOWARTH—C. A. No. 2, 10th June.

PRACTICE—DIVORCE DIVISION—ORDER TO EXECUTE DEED—NEGLECT TO EXECUTE—MOTION FOR ATTACHMENT—SUBSTITUTED SERVICE—ORDER FOR EXECUTION BY REGISTRAR—JUDICATURE ACT, 1884 (47 & 48 VICT. c. 61), s. 14.

This was an appeal by a husband from an order made by Hannen, P., directing the registrar of the court to execute a deed, securing to the wife a sum of £9,100 for her maintenance, which the husband had been ordered on the 28th of July, 1885, to execute, but had not executed. On the 13th of February, 1885, the decree dissolving the marriage was made absolute. A petition for maintenance was filed by the wife pending the proceedings for dissolution of the marriage, and, on July 28, 1885, an order was made that the husband should secure to her a gross sum of £9,100. A deed was settled to carry out the order, and a copy of it was served on the husband's solicitors on November 16, 1885. On March 30, 1886, an order was made that the husband should, within seven days, execute the deed as settled. The wife's solicitors, being unable to serve this order personally, obtained on April 6 an order allowing substituted service on the husband's country solicitors and their London agents. On April 29 notice of motion for the 4th of May for a writ of attachment against the husband for non-compliance with the order of March 30 was served on the London agents. On May 3 a letter was sent by the wife's solicitors to the London agents of the husband's solicitors, giving them notice that, on the motion for an attachment, they should ask the court either for an attachment, or, in the alternative, for an order directing that the deed referred to in the order of March 30 might be executed by some person to be nominated by the court for that purpose. On May 4, on the motion coming on, the wife's counsel asked that the registrar might be ordered to execute the deed on behalf of the husband, in accordance with section 14 of the Judicature Act, 1884. Hannen, P., on production of an affidavit that the letter of May 3 was delivered before five p.m. on May 3 at the office of the London agents of the husband's solicitors, made an order for execution of the deed by the registrar. The Court of Appeal (COTTON, LINDLEY, and LOPES, L.J.J.) affirmed the order. It was urged on behalf of the husband that section 14 of the Judicature Act of 1884 did not apply to proceedings in the Probate and Divorce Division; that the service of the notice of motion of April 29 on the London agents of the husband's solicitors was ineffectual, no special order for substituted service having been obtained; and, also, that the letter of May 3 was not properly served, and not served in sufficient time. Cotton, L.J., said that section 14 of the Act of 1884 applied to every division of the Supreme Court. And he was of opinion, upon the construction of the rules, that the service of the notice of motion for an attachment on the London agents of the husband's solicitors was good service. When there was a difficulty in effecting



personal service it would be wrong not to allow service on the solicitor. That notice asked for an attachment only, and it would have been competent to the President to have made an order for attachment; and, if it had been necessary to discharge the order of May 4, it would have been the duty of the Court of Appeal to have granted an attachment. As a general rule it would not be right to make an order under section 14 of the Act of 1884 *ex parte*. But the motion was for the purpose of compelling obedience to the order of March 30, and the only object of an attachment was to put pressure on the husband to compel him to do that which he ought to have done—viz., to execute the deed. He had been ordered to execute the deed, and he had no right to say that he would rather go to prison. It was not beyond the power of the court to make the order for execution of the deed under section 14 for the purpose of giving effect to the previous order which had been disobeyed. Hannen, P., had satisfied himself that the solicitors who were acting for the husband had been served with the letter of May 3, and knew that the application would be made, and he had full authority to make the order of May 4. LINDLEY and LOPES, L.J.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, *E. Baldock Stone; Middleton. SOLICITORS, Marsland, Hewitt, & Everett; Gregory, Rowcliffe, & Co.*

THE LYDNEY AND WIGPOOL IRON ORE CO., LIMITED v.  
BIRD—C. A. No. 2, 11th June.

COMPANY—PROMOTER—SECRET COMMISSION—AGENT FOR VENDOR—ALLOWANCES.

This action was brought to compel J., who had acted in the promotion of the plaintiff company, to account for a payment secretly made to him out of the purchase-money paid by the company to the vendors of the property which the company was formed to acquire. W., who had formerly been in partnership with J., was also made a defendant. He died after the commencement of the action, and it was revived against his executors. J.'s firm acted as agents for the vendors in the sale of the property. The purchase-money was at first intended to be £90,000, of which £5,000 was to be paid to J.'s firm for their services in the transaction. It was afterwards increased to £100,000, of which £10,800 was to be paid to J.'s firm. An agreement was entered into between Messrs. A., the vendors, and a trustee on behalf of the intended company, by which it was (*inter alia*) agreed that the London business of the company should be carried on at the offices of J.'s firm, who were, in consideration of £600 a year, to provide clerks and pay all office expenses. They were also to be the brokers of the company, and to receive a commission of two per cent. on all sales of the company's ores. They had previously agreed to guarantee the subscription of the necessary amount of shares by the public. The guarantee was ultimately given by W. alone, and £5,000 out of the £10,800 was paid to him as a consideration for his giving this guarantee. He had, at that time, retired from the firm. The contract of purchase was dated the 19th of December, 1871, and it was adopted by the company in January, 1872, after which time the £10,800 was paid to J. The payment of the £10,800 was not in any way mentioned in the prospectus, or in the memorandum or articles of association of the company. Pearson, J., held (L. R. 31 Ch. D. 328), that J.'s firm were simply acting as agents for Messrs. A. in bringing the company out, and were in no way trustees for the company. On the evidence, he came to the conclusion that the fixing of the commission at £10,800 instead of £5,000 had no connection with the increase of the proposed purchase-money, the latter rise being due to the remonstrances of Messrs. A. with regard to the value of the property. The Court of Appeal (COTTON, LINDLEY, and LOPES, L.J.J.) reversed the decision, holding that J. must account for the £10,800, though they were of opinion that there was no evidence against W. LINDLEY, L.J. (who delivered the judgment of the court), said that J. procured the formation of the company. He suggested its formation; he took an active part in the preparation of its prospectus and memorandum and articles of association, in the appointment of two of its first directors, in the appointment of its secretary, and he procured his own firm to be appointed to conduct the sales of the company at a large commission. He fixed the purchase-money at £100,000, and stipulated for the payment of £10,800 to his own firm, and he procured the payment of that sum by the company, and he was himself a director when the last instalments of it were made. He was in truth the person who fastened the contract to pay £100,000 on the company, without disclosing the fact that his firm were to get £10,800 out of the purchase-money. The evidence shewed clearly that, although the Messrs. A. had not agreed to sell at £90,000—i.e., £85,000 plus £5,000 for promotion expenses—they were prepared to do so, and that it was J. who ultimately settled that the nominal purchase-money was to be £100,000, of which he was to have £10,800. On this point their lordships were unable to take the same view of the evidence as that which was taken by Pearson, J. The legal principles applicable did not present any difficulty. It was not correct to say that J. was the agent of the company when it did not exist. Nor was it much less objectionable to talk of his being in a fiduciary relation to the company before the company had any existence. Moreover, to say that J. was a promoter of the company, and, therefore, liable to account to it, was calculated to mislead, for the word "promoter" was ambiguous, and it was necessary to ascertain in each case what the so-called promoter really did before his legal liabilities could be accurately ascertained. In every case it was better to look at the facts, and ascertain and describe them as they were. In the present case J. procured the company to be formed and to be managed in such a way as to transfer from the moneys of the company to himself the sum of £10,800, without informing the company of that fact. The company were told that they had to pay £100,000 for the property, but they did not know that of that sum £10,800 was to go into the pocket of the man who had got the company up, and who had, in fact, increased the purchase-money in order

to get that £10,800. Under these circumstances he could not retain the sum so got. Although not an agent of the company nor a trustee for it before its formation, the old and familiar principles of the law of agency and of trusteeship had been extended, and very properly extended, to meet such a case, and, using the word "promoter" to describe a person acting as J. did, it was perfectly well settled that a promoter of a company was accountable to it for all moneys secretly obtained by him from it, just as if the relationship of principal and agent, or of trustee and cestui que trust, had really existed between him and the company when the money was so obtained. Nor in such a case was it necessary for the company to rescind the whole transaction of which the payment by the company of the money in question was found to be part. The circumstance that J. was acting for Messrs. A. in getting up the company did not exonerate him from liability to account for the £10,800. In procuring that money he was not acting in their interest, but in his own; for, though in form it was part of the price paid to them, the £10,800 was in truth to be paid out to him of the price. His liability to account to the company for this sum rested on his own conduct, not on theirs, and, as an agent was personally responsible for his own torts and frauds, though committed by him for other people, so a person acting as J. did in getting £10,800 from the company, without disclosing the fact, was personally liable to account for it, although in getting up the company he might have been acting for Messrs. A. The next question was what sums were proper to be allowed to J. out of the £10,800. The profit actually made by him was comparatively small. The *Emma Silver Mining Co. v. Grant* (L. R. 11 Ch. D. 918) was cited in order to shew that he ought to be allowed all payments made by him in procuring the formation of the company and the issue of its shares, and that he was only accountable for the net profit made by himself out of the transaction. But it appeared to their lordships wholly wrong to make the company pay for the issue of its own shares. No part of the capital of the company could be properly so applied. To allow J. the £5,000 paid by him to W. for his guarantee would, in effect, be to make the company misapply its capital. On the other hand, J. ought to be allowed all legitimate expenses incurred by him in forming and bringing out the company. This would include (*inter alia*) the fees paid to the solicitors and brokers, and for advertisements, printing, &c. As regarded W., there was not enough evidence to render him liable for the £10,800, or any part of it. The promotion of companies was no part of the business of the firm when he was a member of it. He took no such part in the formation of the company as to make him accountable to it as a promoter, and it was not proved that he knew of the arrangement as to the £10,800, or that he was, in effect, being paid by the company for his guarantee. As against his executors, therefore, the appeal must be dismissed, but, as regarded J., the appeal must be allowed, with costs, and an order must be made charging him with the £10,800 and interest at four per cent., but declaring him entitled to deduct from that sum all sums properly expended by him in forming and bringing out the company, and there must be an inquiry to ascertain those sums.—COUNSEL, *Napier Higgins, Q.C., and Bunting; Giffard, Q.C., and Swinfen Eady; Cozens-Hardy, Q.C., H. Burton Buckley, and Daldy. SOLICITORS, Holdinott & Davies; Munton & Morris; Freeman & Bothamley.*

THOMAS v. TURNER—C. A. No. 2, 11th June.

COPYRIGHT—REGISTRATION—RIGHT TO SUE—TIME OF FIRST PUBLICATION—NEW EDITION OF BOOK—5 & 6 VICT. c. 45, ss. 3, 13, 24.

The question in this case was as to the validity of the registration, under the Copyright Act of 1842, of the time of the first publication of a book. The action was brought to restrain an alleged infringement by the defendant of the plaintiff's copyright in a book. The plaintiff, in his statement of claim, alleged that he had duly registered his book under the Act. The defendant, by his statement of defence, took the objection that the plaintiff could not maintain the action, because in the registration the date of the first publication of the book had not been truly stated. The first edition of the book was published in November, 1881. The plaintiff did not register either that edition, or the second edition, but he registered the third edition, stating the title of the book and describing it as the third edition, and giving as the date of the first publication the 22nd of April, 1885, which was the date of the publication of the third edition. It was admitted that the third edition was a reprint of the first, with some unimportant omissions. The defendant's objection was, that the date of first publication ought to have been stated as November, 1881, and that, by reason of this erroneous statement, the plaintiff was precluded by section 24 of the Act from maintaining the action. Section 3 of the Act provides that "the copyright in every book which shall, after the passing of this Act, be published in the lifetime of its author, shall endure for the natural life of such author and for the further term of seven years," but "if the term of seven years shall expire before the end of forty-two years from the first publication of such book, the copyright shall in that case endure for such period of forty-two years." Section 13 enables the proprietor of copyright in any book to make entry in the registry book of the Stationers' Company of (*inter alia*) "the title of such book and the time of the first publication thereof." And section 24 provides that "No proprietor of copyright in any book which shall be first published after the passing of this Act shall maintain any action or suit at law or in equity in respect of any infringement of such copyright, unless he shall, before commencing such action or suit, have caused an entry to be made in the book of registry of the Stationers' Company of such book, pursuant to this Act; provided always that the omission to make such entry shall not affect the copyright in any book, but only the right to sue in respect of the infringement thereof." Section 2 provides that, in the construction of the Act, "the word 'book' shall be construed to mean and include every volume, part

or division of a volume, pamphlet, sheet of letter-press, sheet of music, map, chart, or plan separately published." Bacon, V.C., overruled the objection, and granted an interlocutory injunction restraining the defendant from publishing his book. The Court of Appeal (CORROX, LINDLEY, and LOPES, L.J.J.) discharged the injunction, holding that the objection was a fatal one. CORROX, L.J., said that sometimes a new edition of a book was an entirely new book; but it might be merely or in substance a reprint of a former edition. The third edition of the plaintiff's book was a mere reprint of the first with some immaterial omissions. The court must look, not only at section 13, but at the other sections of the Act, and especially at section 3, which fixed the duration of the copyright. Section 13 provided for the registration of "the title of such book and the time of the first publication thereof." What was meant by the word "book" there? It was said that, by virtue of section 2, it meant a "volume," and that this third edition was a "volume." In his lordship's opinion this view was incorrect. That which was to be registered was that in which there was to be a copyright under section 3—that is, the work. It must be a work of which the person who made the registration was the author, and not a mere reprint of a former edition. The plaintiff had not complied with the requirements of the Act as to registration. He had no copyright in the third edition, which was a mere reprint of the work which was first published in 1881; the third edition was not a book in which, under section 3, there could be a copyright as distinguished from the original work which was published in 1881. The plaintiff might have a copyright in that, but he could not sue in respect of an infringement of it until he had correctly registered it. This he had not yet done, but he could still do it. LINDLEY, L.J., concurred. He said that, if the third edition had been partly old and partly new, he should have thought that the plaintiff had complied with the requirements of the Act as to registration, though even then he would not have had a copyright in the old parts. LOPES, L.J., said that the object of the Legislature in requiring the date of first publication to be stated in the register clearly was to fix the time from which the period of forty-two years was to run.—COUNSEL, H. Terrell; Harry Nash. SOLICITORS, E. Upton; R. T. Webster.

#### HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Re VAUGHAN, VAUGHAN v. THOMAS—North, J., 11th June.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—PERPETUITY—CHARITY—REPAIR OF TOMB—REPAIR OF CHURCHYARD—43 Geo. 3, c. 100, s. 1.

The question in this case was as to the validity of a bequest partly for the repair of tombs and partly for the repair of a churchyard. The testator bequeathed £500 to trustees, upon trust to invest the same, and to apply such part of the income thereof as might be necessary in or toward the expense of repairing and keeping in repair the family vault which he had erected in the parish churchyard of L., and the residue of such income in or towards the expense of repairing or keeping in repair the tomb erected to the memory of his late brother, and the repairing and keeping in repair the same parish churchyard; and he declared that the legacies bequeathed by him for charitable purposes should be fully paid out of such part of his personal estate as might be legally devoted to charitable purposes in preference to pecuniary legacies. The question was, first, whether the gift to keep in repair the family vault was void, as being a gift in perpetuity, and, if so, whether that made the whole gift bad? If it did not, there was the further question whether the gift to keep in repair the churchyard was valid, either as a charitable gift, or under the Church Building Act (43 Geo. 3, c. 100), and, if so, whether the gift could be apportioned by allowing a sufficient part for keeping in repair the tomb of the testator's brother, so that there could be a good gift of the remainder of the income? NORTH, J., held that the trust to repair the family vault was invalid, not being for a charity, and being a gift in perpetuity. But he held that the gift of the residue of the income was not therefore void, and that, if it would have been valid standing alone, it would be a good gift of the whole income. He held that the trust, so far as it related to the repair of the tomb of the brother, was invalid, but that the trust for repairing the churchyard was good under the Act 43 Geo. 3, being a bequest of goods of not more than £500 in value, and that it was also valid as being a charitable gift. He referred to a similar case, in which there was a trust to repair a vault, and to put up and repair an ornamental window in a church, and to apply the surplus in keeping in repair and maintaining the chancel of the church. It was there held that, so far as the window and chancel were concerned, the trust was good as being charitable. He thought that that which was valid in respect to the ornamenting of God's house was equally valid in respect to repairing what was sometimes called God's acre. The repairing of a churchyard, he thought, fell within the widest definition of a charitable object—viz., a public object. It was for the parishioners' benefit that the churchyard should be kept in order; they were liable to keep it in order, and indictable for not doing so. It had been argued that to keep an individual tomb in order was equally for the benefit of the public. He thought it was not. The desire to keep a tomb in order might arise from family ostentation or pride, or from affection for a member of the donor's family. His lordship held, therefore, that if there had been a gift by itself in trust to repair the churchyard it would have been valid. The next question was how that otherwise valid trust was affected by being joined with another object which was illegal. He held that the fund was apportionable, and, if necessary, an inquiry would be directed how much of the fund would be sufficient to provide for the repair of the tomb of the testator's brother, and it would be declared that there was a valid trust of the balance of the

income of the £500 for the repair of the churchyard.—COUNSEL, Blackmore; Kenyon Parker. SOLICITORS, Thomas White & Son.

#### WHITTINGSTALL v. GROVER—Chitty, J., 9th June.

ADMINISTRATION—DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS—PRIORITY OF CREDITORS—JOINT AND SEPARATE CREDITORS—INTEREST—R. S. C., 1883, LV., 62, 63.

In this case an entirely novel question arose in the distribution of assets between joint and separate creditors—viz., whether, where both classes of creditors have been paid 20s. in the pound, and a surplus remains, the surplus should be distributed *pari passu* in payment of interest, or whether the interest on the separate debts should be paid in priority to that on the joint debts. It appeared that by an order (following *Ex parte Reeve* (9 Ves. 588), and in accord with *Ex parte Findlay* (L. R. 17 Ch. D. 331)) made in 1861 in an action for the administration of the estate of a deceased testator who had been a partner in a banking business, it was declared that the separate creditors of the testator were entitled to be paid out of his estate in priority to the joint creditors, but that the separate creditors, whose debts did not by law or special contract carry interest, were not entitled to interest in priority to the joint creditors in respect of the principal due to the joint creditors. After payment of 20s. in the pound to both joint and separate creditors a surplus remained. It was admitted that the separate creditors whose debts by law carried interest were entitled to priority of payment of interest out of the surplus, and the question was between the joint creditors and the separate creditors whose debts did not by law carry interest, as to whether such separate creditors should be paid, out of the surplus assets, interest in priority to the joint creditors, or whether such assets should be distributed *pari passu*. CHITTY, J., said that the question was one which must be decided on principle. Previously to the orders of 1841 the Court of Chancery did not give interest to a creditor coming in under a decree for the administration of the estate of a deceased person where the debt did not by law carry interest. The orders of 1841, relating to interest, were in substance repeated in the consolidated orders of 1861, and are now embodied in the subsisting rules of court, R. S. C., 1883, LV., 62 and 63. The rules of 1841 were founded on the 17th section of the statute 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110. Previously to that enactment a judgment debt did not carry interest at law, and the Court of Chancery had no jurisdiction to give interest to creditors who came in under its decree for administration where the debts did not by law carry interest. But the court would not, after such a decree, permit a creditor to proceed at law to recover judgment for his debt. Consequently, after the passing of the statute 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, a court of equity, while interfering with the legal right for the common benefit of all the creditors, was bound, on equitable principles, to put him in the same position as if he had exercised it. Hence the order of 1841. Lord Romilly explained the matter substantially to the same effect when he said, in *The Herefordshire Banking Co.* (15 W. R. 1056, L. R. 4 Eq. 250), that the court allowed interest at four per cent. from the date of the decree because the decree was a judgment in equity for the benefit of all the creditors, and prevented them from getting a judgment at law, which would give them interest. The right of the creditor whose debt does not carry interest at law is therefore based upon the provisions of the statute 1 & 2 Vict. c. 110, and the orders of 1841, and the existing rules of the court, which merely give effect to such right. These orders and rules did not, and do not, affect any question between joint and separate creditors, or the rules as to the administration of joint and separate estates. It might in former days have been open to consideration whether the interest of an interest-bearing debt was not just as much part of the debt as the principal. That question, however, had long since finally been set at rest. But was there any sound reason, in a case like the present, which required that the priority of the separate creditors should not be consistently maintained, as well in respect of interest as of capital? He could find none. Nor could he find any reason which, in regard to subsequent interest, would justify the drawing of any distinction between creditors whose debts carried interest by law, and those whose debts carried interest under the General Orders (regard being paid to the rights on which the General Orders were founded), except only the distinction which appeared on the face of the General Orders themselves. The sound rule, therefore, appeared to be that, as between joint and separate creditors, the question of interest should be decided in accordance with the established rule as to the principal. There also remained a question as to the manner in which the dividends received ought to be accounted for in ascertaining the amount of interest due. The account ought to be taken in the manner pointed out in *Bower v. Marris* (Cr. & P. 351) and *The Warrant Finance Co.'s case* (18 W. R. 154, L. R. 4 Ch. 643)—viz., by treating the dividends as ordinary payments on account, and applying each dividend, in the first place, to the payment of interest calculated to the day of such dividend, and the surplus (if any) to the reduction of the principal. The decision of Sir J. Leach in *Ex parte Higginbottom* (2 G. & J. 123) he considered to be overruled by Lord Cottenham in *Bower v. Marris*.—COUNSEL, F. A. Lewin; G. Sangster Green; S. B. Laing. SOLICITORS, Lewin & Co.; E. S. Courroux.

#### COLLS v. ROBBINS—Kay J., 5th June.

PRACTICE—SERVICE OUT OF THE JURISDICTION—PETITION FOR PAYMENT OUT OF COURT—R. S. C., 1883, XI.

This was an application for leave to serve out of the jurisdiction a petition for payment out of court of a share of a fund paid in to the credit of the action. The action was commenced in 1862 by the tenant for life under a certain will, and, in the course of the action, the fund was ordered



to be paid into court. The tenant for life having died, a petition was presented in May, 1886, by one of the persons entitled to one-fifth share of the fund and the mortgagee of that share, asking that the share might be paid out to them. The other persons entitled to the remaining four fifth shares of the fund were all resident out of the jurisdiction—in New Zealand and Australia. It being necessary that these four persons so entitled should be served with the petition, the present application was made to the court for leave to serve the petition out of the jurisdiction. In support of the application it was stated that, although order 11 only provided for service out of the jurisdiction of writs of summons, yet there had been many cases in which the service of petitions out of the jurisdiction had been allowed before the new Rules came into operation. The cases of *Re Bugfield*, *Whaley v. Bugfield* (34 W. R. 372, L. R. 32 Ch. D. 123), and *The Creditors of Girard & Co. v. Van Weede* (32 W. R. 414, L. R. 12 Q. B. D. 171) were referred to. KAY, J., said that, unless he had power to grant leave to serve out of the jurisdiction, he would be unable to deal with the fund. He should, therefore, make the order.—COUNSEL, *Marcy*; *J. Herbert Robertson*. SOLICITORS, *Collis & Mallam*; *A. R. Gillman*.

**CRAWFORD v. CRAWFORD AND DILKE** (The Queen's Proctor shewing cause)—P. D. & A. Div., 11th June.

DIVORCE—DECREE NISI—DISMISSAL OF CO-RESPONDENT FROM SUIT—INTERVENTION BY QUEEN'S PROCTOR—MATERIAL FACTS NOT BROUGHT BEFORE THE COURT—RESTORATION OF CO-RESPONDENT TO SUIT—MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACT, 1860 (23 & 24 VICT. C. 144) s. 7.

This was a husband's suit for a dissolution of marriage. At the trial, before Butt, J., without a jury, the petitioner deposed to a confession made to him by the respondent as to acts of adultery with the co-respondent. The petitioner was not cross-examined by the counsel for the respondent, and his cross-examination by the counsel for the co-respondent was postponed. Butt, J., pronounced a decree nisi, but dismissed the co-respondent from the suit, with costs. The co-respondent, acting under the advice of his counsel, did not go into the witness box. The Queen's Proctor afterwards entered an appearance in the suit, and filed a plea, wherein he alleged that it would be contrary to justice for the decree nisi to be made absolute, since certain material facts had not been brought before the court. He also alleged that there was no corroboration of the respondent's confession to her husband; that certain witnesses who were referred to in such confession, and whose evidence was material, were not called; and that, apart from the confession, there was no evidence of adultery. An order had been made that the Queen's Proctor should give particulars of his plea, and he had furnished a statement of the effect of evidence which would be given by the witnesses referred to in his plea. Three applications were now made to the court. The petitioner first moved to strike out the Queen's Proctor's plea, on the ground that the plea and particulars disclosed no ground for intervention. It was argued that "material facts" must mean facts which would disentitle the petitioner to a decree, independently of his own evidence; that the failure of either party to call witnesses was not a ground for the Queen's Proctor's intervention; and that the Queen's Proctor could not obtain a new trial merely because the result of the first trial was unsatisfactory. HANSEN, P., without calling on the counsel for the Queen's Proctor, said that the question to be decided was, whether, where specific charges of adultery have been investigated and decided in the affirmative, the Queen's Proctor is entitled to intervene for the purpose of shewing that the finding ought to have been the other way, by reason of material facts not having been brought forward. He had held in *Gladstone v. Gladstone* (23 W. R. 519, L. R. 3 P. & D. 260) that, where the Queen's Proctor seeks to establish a charge of adultery, he is entitled to bring forward fresh evidence in support of the same charges; and where the Queen's Proctor says that the original charges were not well founded, it was necessary that he should, if he intervenes at all, produce fresh material facts to disprove the specific charges. That was the only purpose for which he could intervene, and those were the only circumstances under which his intervention could succeed. In the present case, as regards the material facts, the Queen's Proctor's plea had been unnecessarily expanded, since he might have contented himself with the allegation in the first paragraph, that the decree was pronounced contrary to the justice of the case by reason of material facts not being brought before the court, but he had unnecessarily, though no doubt for the purpose of giving information to the petitioner, gone on to insert other statements—namely, that witnesses were in court, and were known by both parties to be in court, who were not called to give evidence. These paragraphs did not raise questions which the petitioner ought to be called upon to meet, for he had only to meet the question whether the decree was contrary to the justice of the case. Since, however, the Queen's Proctor had given the names of a number of these witnesses, an order for particulars had been made, and an abstract or *précis* should be furnished like that which is furnished in criminal cases when additional evidence is discovered. That had not been done with respect to one document, and the Queen's Proctor must be ordered to furnish further particulars. The theory of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1860, was this, that the public has an interest in seeing that no marriage is dissolved except on the ground, in the case of the woman, of adultery, and if the Queen's Proctor arrives at the conclusion, by reason of material facts brought to his notice, that there is ground for believing that the decree was obtained contrary to the justice of the case, it is his duty to intervene and bring those facts to the knowledge of the court. The Queen's Proctor's plea was good, though redundant, and the application to strike it out must be refused, though further particulars must be given. The second application was made on behalf of the respondent, that she might be permitted to take part in the trial of the

issues raised by the Queen's Proctor, and it was urged that she was still a party to the suit, and that there would be virtually a new trial of the issue of adultery. It was also stated the respondent wished to give evidence in support of her former admissions of adultery. The third application was one by the co-respondent's counsel, that he might be restored to the suit, and be permitted to take part in the rehearing, it being contended by his counsel that he would now have to meet the evidence of the respondent, as well as of the petitioner, and that his interests could not be adequately protected by the Queen's Proctor without the assistance of his own legal advisers. HANSEN, P., without calling upon the counsel for the petitioner and for the Queen's Proctor, refused both applications. He pointed out that the question was one for his own discretion, and it had been considered that the Queen's Proctor, being a public officer, and acting under the directions of the Attorney-General, was in a different position from an ordinary intervener, and was not obliged to comply with rules 70–76, by which any other person would be bound. The respondent had had an opportunity of giving any evidence she pleased at the former trial, and there was now no reason for permitting her to take part in the proceedings set on foot by the Queen's Proctor. The case of the co-respondent was somewhat different. He was no longer a party to the suit, and acting under what he believed to be sound advice he had declined to give evidence on his own behalf. All the consequences flowing from the course thus taken must continue during the intervention of the Queen's Proctor, who would do all that was requisite in the interests of justice. The co-respondent's motion would be dismissed with costs, but as against the respondent the question of costs would be reserved until the court was satisfied that she had the means of paying them. The petitioner's costs would be costs in the suit.—COUNSEL, *Inderwick*, Q.C., and *R. S. Wright*; *C. A. Middleton*; *Sir H. James*, Q.C., and *Searle*; *Sir W. G. F. Phillimore* and *H. B. Peane*. SOLICITORS, *Markby & Stewart*; *Lewis & Lewis*; *Taylor, Son, & Humbert*; *The Queen's Proctor*.

**CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS.**

*Re C. J. L. GRAY (A SOLICITOR), Ex Parte EVERITT—C. A. No. 1, 9th and 10th May and 11th June.*

**TAXATION OF COSTS—AGREEMENT.**

This was an appeal by Mr. Everitt from the decision of the Divisional Court. It appeared that, during the years 1884 and 1885, the solicitor acted as solicitor to the appellant with regard to the then projected sale of the patent rights of the appellant under a certain patent which he had obtained for the protection of his inventions. On the 26th of March, 1885, the appellant signed an agreement to the effect that, in consideration of the work done by the solicitor in respect of the patent during the preceding twelve months, he agreed to pay the solicitor £2,000 as the agreed amount of his legal charges in the following manner: £1,000 in cash on the allotment of shares in any company that might be formed for the working of the patent, and £1,000 in fully paid-up shares of such company. Should the sum received by the appellant for the patent be less than £5,000 the solicitor was to receive cash *pro rata*, and shares to make up any balance, but the sum in cash which the solicitor was to receive was in no case to be less than £500. A company was formed to work the patent and an allotment of shares was made, and the solicitor, thereupon, in March, 1886, sued upon the above agreement. The appellant thereupon took out a summons for the delivery and taxation of the solicitor's bill of costs. This application was dismissed by the master and his decision was upheld by the judge at chambers and the Divisional Court. It was urged for the appellant that the agreement was unfair and unreasonable, and that it came within section 8, sub-section 4, of the Solicitors Act, 1881. The Court (LORD ESHER, M.R., and BOWEN, L.J.), after taking time to consider, dismissed the appeal. They did not consider it necessary to their decision to construe the section, but they thought that it was not a suitable case for the decision of a taxing master. The services rendered by the solicitor were, no doubt, such as were properly and frequently rendered by professional gentlemen, and it was clear from the section that the solicitor had the power to sue on such an agreement.—COUNSEL, *Swinfen Eady*; *Cock* and *P. H. White*. SOLICITORS, *Adam Burn & Son*; *J. Gray*.

The Railway and Canal Traffic Bill was withdrawn on the 10th inst., and the Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty Bill on the 11th inst.

A notice was issued to the Parliamentary agents on Wednesday stating that select committees would be immediately nominated at the meeting of the House of Lords on Thursday to consider all opposed private bills now waiting for appointment. The committees, it is understood, would begin their duties on Friday.

On the 15th inst., at the Auction Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, a number of important estates, including that of Duncelt, belonging to the Earl of Crawford, were offered for sale. The bidding for Duncelt commenced at £130,000 and ultimately advanced to £170,000, when, there being no increased offer, the property was withdrawn. It is significant of the condition of the real estate market that out of nine other properties situated in the Highlands none were sold, the only property disposed of being the sporting lands of Loppin, near Tromsø, in the north of Norway, which realised the comparatively small sum of £800.

## THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHANCERY BUSINESS.

THE following are the resolutions passed by the committee:—

1. That it is desirable that the practice and procedure should be, as far as possible, the same in all the courts, chambers and offices of the Chancery Division.
2. That for this purpose the arrangement of all the business in that division should (subject to rules of court) rest with the judges of that division, who should, in concert, from time to time make such provision as they may deem expedient for the conduct of such business.
3. That every judge of the Chancery Division shall have power, at the request of any other judge of that division before whom a cause or matter is pending, to hear the cause or matter or any application therein without any transfer of the cause or matter or consent of parties being necessary.
4. That the whole administrative staff of the Chancery Division in London shall eventually be brought under the control of the several chancery judges, by attaching to each judge a sufficient number of clerks to do all the business of chancery causes and matters, including the drawing of orders and taxing of costs; the duties of such clerks and the distribution of business among them to be determined by rules to be made by the judges of the Chancery Division.
5. That in order to carry out the object of the last preceding resolution, power be taken by which, on any vacancy occurring among the registrars or taxing masters or their clerks, such vacancies shall be filled up by appointing additional chief and other clerks to act with the present chief clerks and their clerks.
6. That it is essential in any re-arrangement of the court business of the Chancery Division that provision be made for the continuous trial of witness actions.
7. That for this purpose additional judicial assistance will be necessary.
8. That an additional judge be appointed to be a judge of the Chancery Division, and that every judge of that division shall have a sufficient staff of clerks to do chamber work.
9. That in the Chancery Division there shall be, as proposed by Mr. Davey, for the purpose of equally distributing the business, three branches, each with two judges, and that the judges of the division shall so arrange that one of them shall sit in chambers on every day in each week, and that in each branch the judges thereof shall so arrange as to try witness causes for as many consecutive days as is possible, having regard to the general arrangement of business.
10. That in case the recommendation contained in the last resolution be not accepted, the scheme proposed by Mr. Justice Pearson for the arrangement of court business be recommended as an alternative scheme.
11. That all causes and matters shall be equally distributed by rotation throughout the branches or courts, as the case may be, of the division by a superior officer attached to the division for that purpose, and that the business within each branch or court shall be divided amongst the chief clerks as the judges may direct.
12. That a separate rotation shall be observed for original petitions, originating summonses, and writs respectively.
13. That writs and summonses issued in a district registry shall be distributed in rotation among the branches or courts by ballot.
14. If the scheme for distribution of the business by means of three branches, as proposed by Mr. Davey, is adopted, it is recommended that all applications in any action or matter made before the trial or hearing of such action or matter be heard by the judge then sitting in chambers; but all applications after the trial or hearing of such action or matter by the judge who has tried or determined the same.
15. On the hearing of any application, the chief clerk in whose division such matter is should attend the judge.
16. That it be recommended that all motions ready for hearing, and not disposed of on the particular day appointed for hearing motions, should be entered in a list and heard on the following day or days.
17. That applications in chambers for payment out of court, which involve the construction of a document or any other question of law, and all originating summonses under order 55, rule 3, the object of which is to obtain the opinion of the court or a judge upon the construction of a document, or any other question of law, and all applications for service out of the jurisdiction, and for substituted service, should come before the judge personally.
18. That so far as possible proceedings in chambers shall, when commenced, be continued until completed, and that for that purpose the system of giving long appointments for a limited time, as for one or two hours, shall be discontinued, and matters in chambers requiring long appointments shall, when ready, be set down in a daily list and taken in turn, and so far as possible be carried on till completion.
19. That any chief clerk shall have power to take any business for any other chief clerk without any order to transfer to him of such business.
20. That counsel shall have audience before the judge sitting in chambers.
21. That appeals from chambers in which counsel for all parties have appeared shall go direct to the Court of Appeal.
22. That in Liverpool and Manchester, and such other places as the Lord Chancellor, having regard to section 22 of the Judicature Act, 1881, may think right, the district registrar shall in causes and matters proceeding in the district registry exercise the jurisdiction (as proposed to be regulated) and perform all the duties of a chief clerk, except where any such cause or matter shall, on the application of any party, be removed by order of a judge to be dealt with in London.

23. That in case any question before a district registrar shall be referred to be heard by a judge in chambers, it shall, if it be a question arising before decree or order, be referred to the judge in chambers, if after decree or order to the judge who made the decree or order.

24. That when an action proceeds in the district registry, the registrar there shall act as taxing master, subject in all respects to the rules and practice regulating the business of the taxing masters of the court and to the revision and direction of the judge to whom the cause is attached.

25. That moneys and securities to be paid into or deposited in court in actions proceeding in a district registry shall (unless otherwise ordered) be paid or deposited at the branch Bank of England of the town in which such registry is situated, and carried by the bank to the account of the Paymaster General of the Supreme Court of Judicature, and that if there is no branch Bank of England in such town, the payment shall be made either to the Bank of England in the manner provided by the Supreme Court Funds Rules, 1884, or to such other bank as shall be ordered.

26. That the manner of completing orders for leave to deliver interrogatories and for discovery and for payment of the requisite deposit into court in the Chancery Division should be assimilated to the practice in those respects in the Queen's Bench Division.

27. That the proviso at the end of order 55, rule 15, be amended as follows:—

"Provided that no order for general administration, or for the execution of a trust, or for accounts or inquiries concerning the property of a deceased person or other property held upon any trust, or the parties entitled thereto, shall be made except upon an application to the judge in person to whose court the cause or matter is attached."

28. That many of the orders made in chambers, other than money orders, should be drawn by the chief clerks unless the judge otherwise directs, and that an order signed by a chief clerk or an endorsement on the summons signed or initialed by a chief clerk be for all purposes sufficient evidence of the order having been made.

29. That the certificate mentioned in order V., rule 9 (c), be countersigned by a chief clerk of the court or branch to which the previous cause or matter has been assigned.

30. That in all cases where a sale, mortgage, partition, or exchange is ordered, the court or a judge shall have power, with a view to avoid expense or delay, or for other good reason, to authorise the same to be carried out—

- a. by laying proposals before the judge in chambers for his sanction;
- b. by proceedings altogether out of court, any moneys produced thereby being paid into court or to trustees, or otherwise dealt with as the judge in chambers may order.

31. That draft certificates be prepared by the solicitor of the party having the carriage of the order and be settled by the judge in chambers when he so directs.

32. That the summons to settle the chief clerk's certificate be abolished, and that notice to attend the settlement be substituted therefor.

33. That the affidavit verifying particulars of sale be abolished, and that the signature of the auctioneer and solicitor be substituted therefor.

34. That the affidavit of the result of sale be abolished, and that a certificate of the auctioneer and solicitor be substituted therefor.

35. That the order to pay purchase-money into court be abolished, and that a purchaser be at liberty to pay his purchase-money into court upon a direction for that purpose signed by the chief clerk.

36. That the signature of the chief clerk to advertisements for creditors be abolished, and that a prepared form to be adapted to circumstances, and signed by the solicitor, be substituted therefor.

37. That the affidavit verifying the consent of a new trustee to act be abolished, and that there be substituted therefor the signature of his solicitor to the written consent signed by the trustee.

38. That in any case where accounts are being taken, if the court or a judge thinks it expedient, directions be given for production and examination of the vouchers at the office of the solicitors or other convenient place, and that only contested or surcharged items be brought before the judge in chambers.

39. It is suggested that the following expedients, which have been found to work well in practice, should be adopted when practicable.

Upon an application for administration by a creditor or beneficiary under a will, intestacy, or deed of trust, where no accounts or insufficient accounts have been rendered:

- A. Order the application to stand over for a certain time, say a month, and that the executors, administrators, or trustees in the meantime should render to the applicant a proper statement of their accounts, with an intimation that if this is not done they may be made to pay the costs of the action.

B. When necessary, to prevent actions by other creditors, make usual judgment or order for administration, with proviso that no proceedings are to be taken under it without leave of the judge in person.

40. As to taxation—

(1.) That the following warrants be abolished:—

- Warrant on leaving.
- Warrant to bring in.
- Warrant to tax.

(2.) That within seven days from the date of the passing of an order directing a taxation of costs, the solicitor having the conduct of the order shall leave at the office of the proper taxing officer a copy of the order and (annexed thereto) a statement containing the names and addresses of the parties appearing in person, and of the solicitors representing the several parties to the action or proceeding who do not appear in person, and the names and the nature of the interest of the parties represented by each solicitor.



(3.) That, on the copy order being left, a notice of an appointment to proceed with the taxation shall forthwith be issued by the taxing officer, and a copy thereof sent by post to the solicitors of such of the parties as he shall direct.

(4.) That at the time mentioned in the notice the taxing officer shall appoint a time within which the bills of costs (with all necessary papers and vouchers) shall be left at his office, and he shall give all necessary directions for the conduct of the taxation pursuant to sub-rule 27 of rule 27, order LXV. of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883.

(5.) That the taxation shall, if possible, be continued without interruption till completed, but if adjourned for any reason notice of the adjournment shall be sent by the taxing officer by post to any solicitor not present at the time of the adjournment whose attendance he may desire at the next appointment.

(6.) That in cases in which the solicitors leave their bills, with the proper papers and vouchers, and with the copy order as above mentioned, the taxing officer may, if he see fit, at once issue a notice, as before provided, fixing a time at which the taxation shall be proceeded with.

(7.) That any solicitor who shall fail to leave his bill of costs (with the necessary papers and vouchers) within the time or extended time fixed by the taxing officer for that purpose, or who shall in any way delay or impede the taxation shall, unless the officer shall otherwise direct, forfeit the fees to which he would otherwise be entitled for drawing his bill of costs and for attending the taxation; and the taxing officer may also, if he shall think fit, exercise all or any of the powers vested in him by sub-rule 28 and sub-rule 55 of the rule 27 before referred to.

(8.) That in every bill of costs the professional charges shall be entered in a separate column from the disbursements, and that every column shall be cast before the bill is left for taxation.

41. That it is expedient for the present—

a. That the judges of the Chancery Division who have chamber business should attend one day a week in their respective chambers to dispose of such business.

b. That on those days counsel should have audience in chambers.

c. That in all cases where any order has been made by a judge in person upon any summons or matter which has been attended by counsel for all parties thereto he should give leave to appeal.

## LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

### LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The fiftieth anniversary dinner of this society was held at the Criterion Restaurant, Piccadilly, on Tuesday evening last, the chair being taken by the Hon. Mr. Justice Grantham. The first toast, which was proposed by the chairman, was that of "The Queen, the Prince and the Princess of Wales, and the other members of the Royal Family," it being received with much enthusiasm, in the course of which the National Anthem was vigorously sung. Mr. J. Elwin then sang an excellent song, "The Golden Wreath," being accompanied by Signor Rubini, the composer. Mr. Melmoth Walters proposed the toast of "The Legislature," which was responded to by Mr. J. Shires Will, Q.C., M.P., in a speech full of fun and good humour. Mr. Owen Dove next gave an amusing recitation entitled "Several Othellos (original and selected)," which was received with prolonged applause. This was followed by the toast of the evening, "The Law Students' Debating Society." In proposing the toast the chairman stated that the society was one of the oldest of the kind in England; that, as he was informed, its past session had been even more successful than usual, and that the roll of members was larger than at any previous period of the society's existence. Mr. Justice Grantham referred to the time, some twenty-five years ago, when he was himself a student member of the society, and after pointing out the great advantages which students derived from attending its discussions, he cordially wished it long life and prosperity. Mr. H. J. Cross then sang Gounod's beautiful rendering of the song "Oh, That we Two were Maying," at the conclusion of which the chairman proposed the health of Mr. Milledge, Q.C., of the Canadian bar. The warmth with which Mr. Milledge was received was a gratifying testimony of the respect with which the legal profession in the colonies is regarded by their brethren at home. Mr. H. W. Parker next proposed the toast "The Bench and Bar," which was responded to by Mr. F. O. Crump, Q.C. The next toast given was "The Incorporated Law Society," which was proposed by Mr. S. D. Waddy, Q.C., and responded to by Mr. H. Roscoe, the president. Then followed the toast "The Old Members," which was proposed by Mr. D. Stewart-Smith. Mr. J. W. Howlett (president of the Brighton Law Society) responded and bore testimony to the affection with which, as one of the oldest members, he still regarded the society. Mr. J. Elwin then favoured the company with another song, called "The Little Fat Grey Man," and was succeeded by Mr. E. F. Turner, who related his experience of "A Sail on the River." The next toast, "The Officers, Past and Present," was proposed by Mr. Swinfen Eady and responded to by Mr. Ernest G. Spiers, the late treasurer. The last toast, "The Chairman," was proposed by Mr. J. Addison, when Mr. Justice Grantham returned thanks. There were 115 gentlemen present, and the proceedings terminated at 11.45 p.m. after a most enjoyable evening.

### PRESTON AND BLACKBURN LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETIES.

A joint debate was held between the Preston Law Debating Society and the Blackburn and District Law Students' Society on the 2nd inst. Mr.

W. E. M. Tomlinson, M.P., in the chair. The case for argument was as follows:—"A. agrees to sell to B. 'the cargo of wheat in the s.s. *London*, now on passage from Bombay to England, *via* Suez Canal.' There is no mistake about the identity of *The London*, and she has such a cargo on board, but she is, in fact, coming round the Cape, and consequently will arrive later than was expected. Is B. bound to take and pay for the cargo?" The speakers for the affirmative were Messrs. S. Davies, J. J. Rawthorn, J. Bell; for the negative, Messrs. J. L. Whitaker, J. W. Carter, A. M. Fletcher. The chairman held that A. was entitled to performance of the contract.

## OBITUARY.

### MR. WILLIAM VAUGHAN JAMES.

Mr. William Vaughan James, solicitor, of Haverfordwest, died on the 12th inst. Mr. James was born in 1827. He was admitted a solicitor in 1855, and he had for many years conducted a large practice at Haverfordwest. He was a perpetual commissioner for Pembrokeshire and Haverfordwest, and he held several important public appointments. He was clerk of the peace for Pembrokeshire, coroner for the lower district of the county, and clerk to the magistrates for the town and county of Haverfordwest, and for the Roose, Dewland, Dungleddy, and Kemes divisions of Pembrokeshire. Mr. James was also for many years deputy-sheriff for the town and county of Haverfordwest.

## LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JAMES CHITTY HANNEN, barrister, who has been appointed a Registrar of the Probate and Divorce Registry of the High Court of Justice in succession to Mr. Henry Linwood Strong, resigned, is the eldest son of the Right Hon. Sir James Hannen, and was born in 1852. He was educated at Rugby and at Trinity College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in Modern History in 1873. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in January, 1876, and he has practised on the South-Eastern Circuit, and at the Sussex and Brighton Sessions. Mr. Hannen is an examiner of the court, and he has been secretary to the President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division since 1875.

Mr. ADAM WILLIAM BURN, solicitor (of the firm of Crosey & Burn), of 13, Moorgate-street, has been elected Clerk to the Glovers' Company, in succession to Mr. Frederick Richard Thomas, resigned. Mr. Burn is the son of Mr. William Burn, solicitor. He was admitted a solicitor in 1879.

Mr. ALFRED DICKINSON, solicitor (of the firm of Parr, Sadler, & Dickinson), of Southport and Ormskirk, has been elected Clerk to the Ormskirk Board of Guardians. Mr. Dickinson was admitted a solicitor in 1877.

Mr. ROBERT CHAPMAN, solicitor, of Leyburn, has been appointed Registrar of the Leyburn County Court (Circuit No. 15). Mr. Chapman has been for some time deputy registrar of the court. He was admitted a solicitor in 1864.

Mr. GEORGE WALTER GLYNNE BRAUMONT, solicitor, of Grantham, has been elected Coroner for the Grantham District of Lincolnshire. Mr. Braumont was admitted a solicitor in 1881. He is clerk of the peace for the borough of Grantham and clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes.

Mr. FREDERICK EDWARD HILLEARY, solicitor (of the firm of Hilleary & Layard), of 5, Fenchurch-buildings, and of Stratford and Leytonstone, has received the degree of LL.D. from the University of Cambridge.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY SPACKMAN, barrister, has been appointed Standing Counsel to the Law Society of Canterbury, New Zealand. Mr. Spackman is the youngest son of Mr. John Spackman, of Bradford, Wiltshire. He is a B.A. of the University of London, and he was called to the bar at Gray's-inn in July, 1878.

## DISSOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP.

THOMAS PORTER LYON and HERBERT CHARLES REYNOLDS, solicitors and notaries public (Lyon & Reynolds), Liverpool and Neston. So far as regards the said Thomas Porter Lyon, who retires from the said firm. The said Herbert Charles Reynolds will continue to carry on the practice on his own account. June 10. [Gazette, June 15.]

## COURT PAPERS.

### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON			
APPEAL COURT		V. C. BACON.	
No. 1.		No. 2.	
Date.			Mr. Justice KAY.
Wed. June 16	Mr. King	Mr. Beal	Mr. Ward
Thursday.. 17	Farrer	Leach	Mr. Pugh
Friday..... 18	Pemberton	Beal	Lavie
Sat..... 19	Ward	Leach	Pemberton





Mond..... 5  
 Tues..... 6  
 Wed..... 7  
 Thursday... 8  
 Friday..... 9  
 Sat.....10  
 Mond.....12  
 Tues.....13  
 Wednesday 14  
 Thurs.....15  
 Friday.....16  
 Sat.....17  
 Monday.....19  
 Tues.....20  
 Wed.....21  
 Thursday...22  
 Friday.....23  
 Saturday...24

Monday... 26  
 Tuesday.....27  
 Wed.....28  
 Thurs.....29  
 Friday.....30  
 Sat.....31  
 Mon., Aug 2  
 Tuesday.....3  
 Wednesday...4  
 Thursday...5  
 Friday.....6  
 Saturday...7  
 Monday.....9  
 Tues.....10  
 Wed.....11  
 Thursday...12

## HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE. CHANCERY DIVISION.

Before Mr Justice STIRLING.  
 Causes for Trial (with witnesses).  
 Barton v Backhouse act  
 G m Milling Co v Robinson act  
 (22 June)

Transferred from Justice KAY,  
 CHITTY, and PRARSON, for trial or  
 hearing only, by order dated 22 Dec,  
 1885  
 Stothert v Tillery Coal Co act (10 July)  
 Alexander v Tunbridge Wells Imp  
 Commrs act (part heard by Mr  
 Justice Butt)  
 Tolpitt v Harrison act  
 Webb v St John's Gas Co act (not  
 before 1 Nov)  
 Mayfair Mansions Co ld v Brit and For  
 Contracts Corps act  
 Robertson v Hartopp act  
 Gt Western Ry Co v Scourfield act  
 Ecclesiastical Comm v Withers act  
 Lewis v Baskerville act  
 In re Sugg, Sugg v Sugg act  
 Jones v Balcock act

Barker v Perry act (to be mentioned  
 23 June)  
 In re Evan Jones Jones v Williams  
 act  
 In re Wickham Marony v Taylor  
 act (to go to end of list)  
 J W Weidhen v Scottgood act J  
 Weidhen v Scottgood act & m f j  
 (part heard 6 July)  
 Reid v Reid act (restored to end of list)  
 The Ladywell Mining Co v Brookes  
 act  
 The Same Co v Huggons act

Transferred from Justices KAY,  
 CHITTY, and PRARSON, for trial or  
 hearing only, pursuant to order  
 dated May 11, 1886  
 Dudgeon v Foster act  
 Strickland v Ivons act  
 De Vincent Vincent v Vincent act  
 Ranny v Wilson act  
 United Telephone Co v St George act  
 To be continued.

## PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

The probate and matrimonial causes set down for trial during the  
 ensuing Trinity Sittings will be taken in the following order:—Common  
 jury causes on Wednesday, June 23, and following days. The probate  
 causes will be taken first; afterwards, the matrimonial causes. The  
 causes for hearing before the court itself will be taken after the common  
 jury causes—(1) the defended matrimonial causes; (2) probate causes;  
 (3) undefended matrimonial causes. Special jury causes will be taken on  
 Friday, July 23, and following days—(1) the probate causes; (2) the  
 matrimonial causes. Summonses will be heard in chambers at half-past  
 ten o'clock, and motions in court at half-past eleven, on Tuesday next,  
 the 22nd inst., and on each succeeding Tuesday during the sittings. All  
 papers for motions on Tuesdays must be left with the clerk of the papers in  
 the Probate Registry, Somerset House, or with the chief clerk of the  
 Divorce Registry, at the same place, before two o'clock on the preceding  
 Thursdays.

## COMPANIES.

### WINDING-UP NOTICES.

#### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES. LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ABER AND YNISAWDRE COAL AND COKE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding  
 up, presented June 2, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on June 26. Smith  
 and Co, Lancaster House, Savoy, solicitors for the petitioners  
 CHATELAIN IRON COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before July  
 9, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or  
 claims, to Joseph Renshaw Wain, Tunstall, July 23 at 11 is appointed for  
 hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims  
 GEORGE AND JOSEPH OLIVER, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented June  
 9, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on June 26. Hughes and Co, New  
 Broad st, solicitors for the petitioner  
 HIGHAM CREEK BRICK COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before  
 July 19, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or  
 claims, to John Henry Willoughby, Gravesend, July 14 at 12 is appointed for  
 hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims  
 OLD CARBONVILLE FOUNDRY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before  
 July 19, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or  
 claims, to Thomas Eli Gibson, Crews, July 27 at 11 is appointed for hearing  
 and adjudicating upon the debts and claims  
 FARMERS PRESS AGENCY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented  
 June 5, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on June 26. Maynard, Clifford's  
 inn, Fleet st, solicitor for the petitioners  
 FARMERS PRESS AGENCY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented  
 June 10, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on June 26. Kennedy, Chancery  
 lane, solicitor for the petitioner  
 STEEP GRADE TRAMWAYS AND WORKS COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made  
 by North, J., dated June 6, it was ordered that the company be wound up.  
 Rooks and Co, King  
 st, Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioners  
 SULLYMAN AND SHERBORN TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Kay, J., has, by an  
 order dated May 20, appointed William Dodd, 1, Tower buildings, Liverpool, to be  
 official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Sept 1, to send their  
 names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above.  
 Nov 1 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

WEST OF ENGLAND SHIPPING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, pre-  
 sented May 28, directed to be heard before North, J., on June 26. Thomas and  
 Hick, Cannon st, solicitors for the petitioner. [Gazette, June 11.]

BRITISH WHITE LEAD COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Kay, J., dated  
 May 15, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Rooks and Co, King  
 st, Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioners

LIVET AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Chitty, J., has fixed Wednesday, June 23, at 12,  
 at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator

MORNING NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Bacon,  
 V.C., dated June 7, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Wain-  
 right and Baillie, Staple inn, solicitors for the petitioners

PATENT METALLIC STONE COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by North, J.,  
 dated June 8, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Webb and  
 Templeton, Essex st, Strand, solicitors for the petitioner

PONTNEWYD STEEL AND TIN PLATE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Chitty, J., has, by an  
 order dated March 8, appointed George Alfred Hemming, Elm grove, Lancing,  
 to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before July 19, to send  
 their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims.  
 Thursday, July 23, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the  
 debts and claims

SHERATHEE, SONS, AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by Chitty, J.,  
 dated June 5, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Linklater and  
 Co, Walbrook, solicitors for the petitioners

STEEP GRADE TRAMWAYS AND WORKS COMPANY, LIMITED.—North, J., has fixed  
 Friday, June 25, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official  
 liquidator [Gazette, June 15.]

### UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

SKEJNESS AND ST. LEONARD'S TRAMWAY COMPANY.—Petition for winding up,  
 presented June 10, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on June 26. Mew,  
 King st, Cheapside, solicitor for the petitioner [Gazette, June 15.]

### FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

PRINCE OF WALES LODGE OF THE LOYAL ORDER OF TRUE IVORITES, Black Horse  
 Inn, Pontardulais, Glamorgan. June 7  
 VALE OF TOWT LODGE, GRAND UNITED ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS, Rose and  
 Crown Inn, Carmarthen, June 8. [Gazette, June 15.]

### SUSPENDED FOR THREE MONTHS.

FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Bush Inn, Narberth, Pembroke. June 7 [Gazette, June 11.]

## CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

### CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

BELL, THOMAS, Malden lane, Strand. July 2. Little v Bell, Chitty, J. Beoley  
 and Co, Lincoln's inn fields [Gazette, June 4.]

CARR, HENRY SMITH, Sheffield. July 6. Carr v Carr, Chitty, J. Fretson and  
 Son, Sheffield  
 WILKINS, JOHN, Kirkby Lonsdale, Westmoreland, Yeoman. July 5. Emsley v  
 Wilkins, Kay, J. Sill, Middlesborough [Gazette, June 8.]

BASKERVILLE, ISAAC, Stretton, nr Malpas, Chester, Farmer. July 7. Shufflo-  
 botham v Twiss, V.C. Bacon Cartwright, Chester  
 JONES, WILLIAM, Penrhyn Waelawr, Llanbeblig, Carnarvon, Quarryman. July  
 8. Jones v Williams, V.C. Bacon. Roberts and Roberts, Bangor  
 ROBINSON, CHARLES, Bradford, York, Dyer. June 28. Robinson v Robinson  
 Registrar, Bradford. Atkinson, Bradford [Gazette, June 11.]

BETTS, WILLIAM, Dias, Norfolk. July 13. Bockett v Campbell, Chitty, J. Cun-  
 ingham, Carlisle  
 ROBINSON, CHARLES, Bradford, York, Dyer. June 28. Robinson v Robinson,  
 Registrar, Bradford. Atkinson, Bradford [Gazette, June 15.]

### CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP 36. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

ALLCOCK, SUSANNA MARIA, Edgbaston, nr Birmingham. July 13. Tarterton and  
 Butlin, Birmingham  
 BIGGENDEN, HARRIET, East Peckham, Kent. July 1. Stanning, Tonbridge  
 BLUNDELL, ANN, Southport, Lancaster. June 30. Buck and Co, Southport  
 BONNETT, SARAH, Wraybury, Bucks. Aug 2. Johnson, Faversham  
 BUCKNELL, ANN, Bicester, Oxford. July 1. Lindsey, Bicester  
 CLOVER, JOHN, Rattlesden, Suffolk, Miller. June 24. Blandy and Witherington,  
 Reading

CRICKMAY, CHARLES HAYTER, Weymouth, Commercial Traveller. June 24.  
 Howard Bowen, Weymouth

CROOME, JAMES CAPEL, Bagendon House, Gloucester, Esq. July 1. Mullings  
 and Co, Cirencester

DE VAYNES, JULIA ANNE, Margate, Kent. July 15. Daniel, Ramsgate  
 DONALD, MATTHEWMAN HODGSON, Stanwix, Cumberland, Cotton Manufacturer.  
 July 15. Donald and Ostell, Carlisle

FIDAGATE, SOPHIA, Guildford, Surrey. June 24. Capron and Sparks, Guildford.  
 HASLEHAM, HORATIO, Grove rd, Holloway, of no occupation. July 24. Nutt and  
 Savery, Brabant st, Philip lane

HODGE, FRANCIS BULLEN, Plymouth, Draper. June 28. Greenway and Son,  
 Plymouth

HULTON, MALLY, Southport, Lancaster. June 30. Buck and Co, Southport  
 KAY, WILLIAM, Stalybridge, Chester, Gent. June 21. Buckley and Miller,  
 Stalybridge

KEEN, RICHARD, Church st, Camberwell, Boot Maker. June 30. Pattison and  
 Co, Queen Victoria st

KENWARD, EDWARD, Croydon, Surrey. July 8. Simpson and Co, Three Crown  
 sq, Southwark

MACDONALD, GEORGE, Birkdale, Lancaster, Accountant. July 13. Cottrell and  
 Son, Birmingham

MACHILL, FRANCIS, Chidwell, in Soothill, York, Farmer. July 1. Ibberson  
 Dewsbury

MAILE, CHARLES, Earith, Huntingdon, Dealer. July 15. Wallingford and Co,  
 St Ives

OVERALL, WILLIAM, Moreton, Essex, Farmer. July 15. Gibson, Ongar  
 PACHMAN, JANE, Woodford, Essex. June 24. Finch, Cannon st  
 PRARSON, ELIZA, Bishop Thornton, York. July 1. Blacklock, Leeds  
 PHILLIPS, WILLIAM, Clent, Worcester, Innkeeper. July 15. Perry, Stourbridge  
 PRICE, SARAH, Southport, Lancaster. June 30. Buck and Co, Southport  
 PRICE, WILLIAM, Southport, Lancaster, Gent. June 30. Buck and Co, South-  
 port

REDFORD, GEORGE, Southport, Lancaster, Gent. June 30. Buck and Co, Southport.  
SEABRIGHT, JAMES, Trowbridge, Wilts, Engineer. June 30. Mann and Rodway, Trowbridge.  
SCHOLFIELD, SUSAN, Halifax. July 1. England and Foster, Halifax.  
SHEEN, SAMUEL THOMAS ALEXANDER, Queen's rd, Dalston, Licensed Victualler. July 1. Freemans and Dicker, Gutter lane.  
THURSTON, JOHN, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. July 1. Westwood, Birmingham.  
TOWNSEND, SIMON, Halifax, Joiner. July 1. Jubb and Co, Halifax.  
WATSON, CHARLOTTE AMELIA, Halifax. July 1. England and Foster, Halifax.  
WILKINSON, MARY, Kingston upon Hull. July 1. Jackson and Son, Hull.  
[Gazette, June 1.]

BENNETT, WILLIAM ANTONY BURLTON, Clarges st, Piccadilly, Esq. Aug 2. Norton and Co, Victoria st, Westminster Abbey.  
BODGER, SARAH, Tysoe st, Clerkenwell, Corn Merchant. Aug 31. Crosse and Sons, Lancaster place, Strand.  
BOUYERIE, ELIZABETH ANN, Brighton. July 4. Tylee and Co, Essex st, Strand.  
BOYS, JOHN, Walsall, Stafford, Timber Merchant. July 1. Clarke, Walsall.  
BOYS, THOMAS, Walsall, Stafford, Brickmasters' Manager. July 1. Clarke, Walsall.  
CHATTERIS, ANN, Lower Clapton. July 16. Wootton and Son, Finsbury circus.  
COLLS, BENJAMIN, Tonbridge Wells, Tailor. June 30. Lettis Brothers, Bartlett's bldgs.  
CULLIS, WILLIAM, Percy circus, Clerkenwell, Gent. July 5. Coode and Co, Bedford row.  
CUMMING, MARY ANN, Cheltenham. July 30. Lindsay and Co, Edinburgh.  
DURANT, RICHARD, High Canons, Hertford. July 31. Norton and Co, Victoria st, Westminster Abbey.  
EARNSHAW, SARAH, Paddock, Huddersfield. Aug 4. Haigh and Son, Huddersfield.  
FIELD, EDWARD, Norwich, Solicitor. July 19. Field, Norwich.  
GIBBS, JOSEPH HUGHES, Lexham gdns. July 31. Johnson and Co, Austin Friars.  
HOLDSWORTH, WALTER, Spring Hall, Halifax, Esq. July 17. Ingram and Huntriss, Halifax.  
HORSLEY, GEORGE, South Lambeth rd, Esq. July 5. Tylee and Co, Essex st, Strand.  
IRVING, WILLIAM, Barrow in Furness, Ironmonger. June 15. Taylor, Barrow in Furness.  
JOLLY, THOMAS, Beauford rd, Wandsworth rd. June 29. Bohan, Chancery lane.  
MORGAN, THOMAS, West Cowes, Isle of Wight. July 1. Darnall and Son, Cowes.  
PETT, DR ALFRED, Avenue rd, Regent's park. July 5. Janson and Co, Finsbury circus.  
RAKE, GEORGE, Southsea, Hants, Architect. June 22. Besant and Wills, Portsea.  
RICHARDS, DAVID, Heel, Burton, Pembroke, Esq. July 1. James, Haverfordwest.  
RUGGLES, JAMES, Walthamstow, Essex, Timber Merchant. Aug 2. Houghtons and Byfield, Gracechurch st.  
ST QUINTIN, CHARLES BLITSON, Newport Pagnell, Buckingham. July 1. Morse, Lime st sq.  
TIMPSON, THOMAS, Grindleton, York, Farmer. July 20. Hall and Co, Clitheroe.  
SOMERSET, LADY FRANCES SARAH, Clanricarde gdns, Bayswater. July 31. Bartlett, Arthur st West.  
TOWNEND, CHARLES, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Esq. Sept 4. Withington and Co, Manchester.  
WATSON, WILLIAM, Northfleet, Kent. Aug 1. Bewley, Gravesend.  
WISDOM, HENRY CONSTABLE, Tonbridge Wells, Esq. Aug 2. Norton and Co, Victoria st, Westminster Abbey.  
[Gazette, June 4.]

ADAM, GEORGE, Upper George st, Edgware rd. July 16. Lawrence and Sons' Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn.  
BATEMAN, BENJAMIN, Bishopsgate st Without. June 30. Chamberlain, Finsbury sq.  
BATTISCOMBE, WILLIAM BENJAMIN, Brighton, Retired Major. July 27. Gregson, Angel ct, Throgmorton st.  
BRISTOW, JOHN, Saham Toney, Norfolk, Farmer. July 14. Grigson and Robinson, Watton.  
BROOKE, ELIZABETH, Stockport, Chester. June 30. Johnson and Johnsons, Stockport.  
BROWN, ELIZABETH, Willington Quay, Northumberland. July 18. Elsdon and Dransfield, Newcastle upon Tyne.  
CLAUDE, PETER FRANCIS VICTOR EUGENE, Old Jewry chmbrs, Watch Manufacturer. July 12. Smeaton and Co, Lincoln's inn fields.  
CLAXTON, ELIZA, Dalkey, near Dublin. July 14. Payne and Frodsham, Liverpool.  
CONEY, HELEN MARY, Maidenhead, Berks. July 31. Harwood and Stephenson, Lombard st.  
COX, HENRIETTA, Kirkside, Blackheath, Kent. July 5. Hores and Pattinson, Lincoln's inn fields.  
DAVISON, ROBERT, Alnwick, Northumberland, Builder. July 6. Middlemans, Alnwick.  
EDGE, HARRIETTE, Evesham, Worcester. July 31. Byrch and Cox, Evesham.  
GOD, JOHN, East Stonehouse, Devon, Marble Mason. Sept 8. Curtis and Dawe, Plymouth.  
GREGSON, DOROTHY, Barrow in Furness. June 22. Taylor, Barrow in Furness.  
HALE, RICHARD, Henhew, Nutfield, Surrey, Yeoman. Aug 2. Morrison, Reigate.  
HALLAM, CHARLOTTE, Sheffield. July 17. Fretton and Son, Sheffield.  
HANNAN, WILLIAM, Cardiff. July 1. Belcher, Cardiff.  
HEYWOOD, ESTHER, Bolton, Lancashire. June 21. Wilson, Wigan.  
HUNTER, WILLIAM, Sunderland, Agent. July 1. Bell and Son, Sunderland.  
IZON, CLARENCE BOVILL, Bombay, India, Judge. Aug 31. Colmore, Birmingham.  
LAING, MARY ELIZABETH, Haverstock hill. July 20. Kinsey and Co, Bloomsbury place.  
LISLE, EDWARD, Penarth, Glamorgan, Esq. July 8. Williams, Cardiff.  
MARSH, WILLIAM, Hindley, Lancaster, Quarry Master. June 26. Heald and Sons, Wigan.  
NUTTER, TIMOTHY, Coburn st, Bow rd, Gent. July 12. Young and Sons, Mark lane.  
PRESTON, ROBERT, Birmingham, Gent. July 20. Clarke and Sons, Bristol.  
QUILTER, ELIZA, Southampton. July 16. Lomer and Son, Southampton.  
RICHARDSON, HARRIETTE ANNIE, Campden hill rd, Kensington. July 13. Coode and Co, Bedford row.  
RICKETS, JOHN, Leyton, Essex, Gent. July 16. Hand, New inn, Strand.  
ROUTE, WILLIAM DELACOUR, East Indian United Service Club, St James's sq, Esq. Aug 7. Lawrence, Essex st, Strand.  
SANDRES, WILLIAM HENRY, Cloudeley st, Islington. June 30. Eagleton and Son, Chancery lane.  
SILVESTER, EDWARD, Upper Cheyne row, Chelsea, Van Proprietor. June 24. Frederick Snelling, Choumert rd, Peckham.  
SIMON, JEANNE, Longridge rd, Earl's Court. July 1. Nichols, Clanricarde gdns, Kensington.  
SKINKEH, WILLIAM MUGGERIDGE, St Leonard's on Sea, Livery Stable Keeper. June 21. Chalinder, Hastings.  
SLAOG, JANE, Chilton, Gloucester. Aug 2. Nicol and Co, Lime st.  
SWAIN, DAVID, Newtown, Montgomery, Retired Grocer. June 10. Talbot and Wood, Newtown.  
VANE, SIR HENRY MORGAN, Eaton place, Kent. July 1. Parkin and Woodhouse, New sq, Lincoln's inn.

WINSTONE, THOMAS, Cardiff. July 3. Rees, Cardiff.  
WORMALL, HANNAH, Shaw, Lancaster, Innkeeper. Aug 1. Standing and Taylor, Rochdale.  
WORMALL, WILLIAM, Shaw, Lancaster, Innkeeper. Aug 1. Standing and Taylor, Rochdale.  
[Gazette, June 8.]

BARNES, LAVINIA, Gilling Castle, York. July 10. Ware and Son, York.  
BEDDING, MATTHEW, Isleworth, Farmer. July 21. Peake, New inn, Strand.  
BELL, JOHN, Covent Garden Market, Potato Salesman. July 20. May and Co, Adelaide pl, London Bridge.  
BENNETT, MARY, Chedzey, Somerset. July 14. Kite, Taunton.  
CHALLETTE, MARY KEMP, Eastbourne. July 10. Hudson Matthews and Co, Queen Victoria st.  
CHARLEY, JOHN, West Bromwich, Stafford, Publican. July 31. Caddick, West Bromwich.  
COUTIN, LEONTEINE, Woodland rd, Upper Norwood. Aug 1. Argles, Great St Helen's.  
CRETNEY, THOMAS, Barrow in Furness, Cordwainer. July 9. Morgan and Nalder, Barrow in Furness.  
CUMMING, MARY ANN, Cheltenham. July 30. Lindsay and Co, Charlotte sq, Edinburgh.  
DENYING, CHARLOTTE ANGELINA, Jubilee st, Mile End. July 15. Cooke, Finsbury circus.  
ELLIS, THOMAS, Bootham, York, Gent. Aug 1. Ware and Son, York.  
FRANKS, LAWRENCE, Holbeach, Lincoln, Gent. July 20. Sturton, Holbeach.  
FRASER, HENRY, Manchester, Tailor. July 31. Dixon, Manchester.  
GREENHALGH, REVEL JOHN, Ironbridge, Salop, Draper. July 11. Potts and Potts, Broseley.  
HONEY, ELIZA, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. July 31. Green and Williams, Nottingham.  
JENKINS, JACOB, Cardiff, Tug-boat Owner. June 23. Lewis, Cardiff.  
LAW, JAMES, Bradford, York, Gent. July 22. Robinson and Co, Bradford.  
MAPLETON, ANN, Wimborne, Dorset. Aug 11. Eldridge and Sons, Newport.  
MAY, JOHN, Overhill rd, Dulwich, Farmer. July 20. May and Co, Adelaide pl, London Bridge.  
MCCOULL, GEORGE, Ovington on Tyne, Northumberland, Surgeon. July 31. Armstrong and Sons, Newcastle upon Tyne.  
NORTON, AUGUSTA, Albemarle st. July 1. Park and Co, Essex st, Strand.  
PARKER, JOSEPH, Nuneaton, Warwick, Brick Manufacturer. July 15. Bland, Nuneaton.  
POTTS, MARY, Preston. July 6. Dean and Son, Preston.  
PRICE, JANE, Tredegar, Monmouth. July 1. Shepherd, Tredegar.  
PRIDDY, ARTHUR HENRY, Witham, Essex, Wine Merchant. July 10. Stevens and Co, Witham.  
ROBERTS, ISMAEL, Sutton, Surrey. July 21. Gellatly and Co, Lombard st.  
ROBERTS, SAMUEL, Mile End rd, Gent. July 23. Armstrong and Lamb, Old Jewry.  
SANDYS, the Right Honourable LOUISA, Dowager Lady. July 24. Curtler and Co, Worcester.  
SHAW, EDWARD DETRICH, Wolverhampton, Hardware Merchant. July 31. Colebourn, Wolverhampton.  
SIMMS, ELIZABETH MARY, Scarborough, York. July 1. Drawbridge and Rowntree, Scarborough.  
SEVINGTON, EDWARD, Bedford, Farmer. July 10. Mitchell and Webb, Bedford.  
TAYLOR, WILLIAM, Bradford, York, Doctor of Medicine. July 19. Taylor and Co, Bradford.  
TOWNSEND, JOSEPH, Redland, Bristol, Gent. July 17. Danger and Cartwright, Bristol.  
VESIE, ELISA, Axbridge, Somerset. July 6. Phillips, Gresham bldgs.  
WARDEN, JOSEPH, Edgbaston, Birmingham, Gent. Aug 2. Powell and Browett, Birmingham.  
WELLES, JOHN CHARLES, De Beauvoir rd, Kingsland. Aug 1. Newton and Wyatt, Finsbury circus.  
WESTON, JOHN, Upper Berkeley st, Merchant. July 19. Bell and Co, Lincoln's inn fields.  
WHEELER, EMMA, Cedars rd, Clapham Common. July 15. Francis, Fish at hill.  
WOODS, GEORGE JOHN, Oaklands, nr Bulth, Brecon, Esq. Aug 10. White and Sons, Bedford row.  
[Gazette, June 11.]

## SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

June 21.—Messrs. SEDGWICK, SON, & WEALL, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Land, &c. (see advertisement, June 5, p. 9).  
June 22.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, June 5, p. 4).  
June 23.—Messrs. FAIRBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & CO., at 21, Old Bond street, at 2 p.m., Furniture (see advertisement, June 5, p. 8).  
June 23.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Reversions, Life Interest, and Policies (see advertisement, June 12, p. 2).  
June 23.—Mr. JOHN LEES, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Properties (see advertisement, June 12, p. 2).  
June 24.—Messrs. BAKER & SONS, at the White Lion Hotel, Aldeburgh, at 2 for 1 p.m., Freehold Building Land (see advertisement, June 5, p. 3).  
June 24.—Messrs. HUMBERT, SON, & FLINT, at the Mart, Freehold Estates (see advertisement, June 5, p. 9).  
June 24.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at the Mart, Freehold and Leasehold Estates (see advertisement, June 5, p. 9).  
June 24.—Messrs. WALTON & LEE, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, June 5, pp. 10 and 12).  
June 25.—Messrs. BAKER & SONS, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold, Leasehold, and Copyhold Estates, Shares, &c. (see advertisement, June 5, p. 3, and this week, p. 560).

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

## BIRTHS.

HILL.—June 3, at The Lindens, Epsom, the wife of Lionel Furneaux Hill, M.A., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.  
KORTS.—May 26, at Beatrice Villa, Sea Point, Cape Town, South Africa, the wife of B. de Korts, barrister-at-law, of a daughter. (By cablegram.)  
PERRETT.—June 9, at Toldeberry, St. Nicholas-road, Upper Tooting, the wife of Henry Perrett, solicitor, of a daughter.

## MARRIAGES.

EDWARDS.—FEARON.—June 12, at St. George's, Hanover-square, William Douglas Edwards, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Ellen Augusta, daughter of the late Charles Augustus Fearon, of Sible Hedingham, Essex.  
FELL.—NOBLE.—June 9, at All Saints', Stock, Essex, Henry Walter Fell, of Lincolns-inn, barrister-at-law, to Ada Catherine, daughter of the late Henry Noble, of Hong Kong.  
MACLEOD.—NELSON.—June 9, at Edinburgh, Simon John Fraser Macleod, LL.B., barrister-at-law, of No. 44, Gloucester-place, Hyde-park, W., to Catherine Florence, daughter of William Nelson, Esq., Publisher.  
MARRIOTT.—FRIEDELTON.—June 8, at Emsibetone, Leicestershire, Richard



Marriott, solicitor, Nottingham, to Selena, daughter of Thomas Freckleton, of Salisbury Grange.  
 THORNTON—LUMSDEN.—June 12, at St. Mary Abbot's, Kensington, Swinford Leslie Thornton, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Katherine Matilda Mary Gordon, daughter of Charles Gordon Lumsden, late 8th Hussars.

DEATHS.  
 MALLINSON.—June 7, at Dobroyd Castle, Todmorden, John Mallinson, of Manchester, solicitor.  
 PETO.—June 7, at Axelles-sur-Mer, Ernest William Peto, solicitor.

PER, TWO GUINEAS, for a sanitary inspection and report on a London dwelling-house. Country surveys by arrangement. The Sanitary Engineering and Ventilation Company, 115, Victoria-street, Westminster. Prospectus free.—[ADVT.]

FURNISH ON NORMAN & STACEY'S HIRE PURCHASE SYSTEM; No Deposit; 1, 2, or 3 years; 60 wholesale firms. Offices; 79, Queen Victoria-street, E.C. Branches at 121, Pall Mall, S.W., and 9, Liverpool-street, E.C.—[ADVT.]

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

FRIDAY, June 11, 1886.

## RECEIVING ORDERS.

Albury, John, Reading, Grocer. Reading. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam July 15 at 2 at Assize Courts, Reading.  
 Beckett, William Cole, Green lanes, Stoke Newington, Bootmaker. Edmonton. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam July 9 at 1 at Court house, Edmonton.  
 Benaley, Charles, Northdolph, Norfolk, Carpenter. King's Lynn. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam June 24 at 11 at Court house, London rd, King's Lynn.  
 Benson, John Sharpley, Macclesfield, Commercial Traveller. Macclesfield. Pet May 24. Ord June 9. Exam June 29 at 11.  
 Bradford, William, Sunderland, Grocer. Sunderland. Pet June 4. Ord June 4. Exam June 17.  
 Brewis, James Wilkinson, Newcastle on Tyne, Clerk. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam June 17 at 11.30.  
 Curry, Frederick William, Helston, Cornwall, Tailor. Truro. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 19 at 11.30.  
 Deakin, William, Walsall, Corn Factor. Walsall. Pet June 5. Ord June 7. Exam June 28 at 3.  
 De Mattos, William Nicholas, Leadenhall st, Commission Merchant. High Court. Pet May 7. Ord June 8. Exam July 14 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Easton, Frederick, Westfield, Sussex, Builder. Hastings. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam July 12.  
 Eldershaw, Henry Newton, Congleton, Cheshire, Mill Owner. Macclesfield. Pet May 21. Ord June 9. Exam June 29 at 11.  
 Etheridge, George, Otterbourne, Hampshire, Farmer. Winchester. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam July 14 at 10.  
 Evans, Charles, West st, Cambridge Heath, Mineral Water Manufacturer. High Court. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam July 16 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Frost, Richard Percival Bodeley, Verulam bldgs, Gray's inn, no occupation. High Court. Pet May 10. Ord June 9. Exam July 23 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Gilpin, Henry, Sheffield, Jeweller. Sheffield. Pet June 5. Ord June 7. Exam June 23 at 11.30.  
 Griffin, Edwin, Cornwall, Dealer. Truro. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 19 at 11.30.  
 Griffiths, Charles, Huddersfield, Draper. Huddersfield. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam July 12 at 11.  
 Hardwick, George Fernald, Stockton on Tees, Licensed Victualler. Stockton on Tees and Middleborough. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam June 16.  
 Harvey, Percy Portway, Mark lane, Corn Merchant. High Court. Pet June 5. Ord June 5. Exam July 16 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Henderson, James, Morpeth, Northumberland, Plumber. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam June 17 at 11.30.  
 Houldcroft, Rebecca, Liverpool, Milliner. Liverpool. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam June 28 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool.  
 Hutchings, James, Brighton, Commission Agent. Brighton. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam June 24 at 11.  
 James, Richard Morgan, Carmarthen, Saddler. Carmarthen. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam June 19.  
 Johnson, Thomas Charles, Bridge rd, Hammersmith, no occupation. High Court. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam July 9 at 12 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Kelman, James, Normanton, Yorks, Draper. Wakefield. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam July 8.  
 Kettle, Samuel, Dresden, nr Longton, Staffordshire, Baker. Stoke upon Trent and Longton. Pet June 5. Ord June 7. Exam June 29 at 3.  
 Loveys, James Isaac, Dawlish, Devon, Builder. Exeter. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam July 15 at 11.  
 Luscombe, George, Bingley, Yorks, Pot Hawker. Bradford. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam June 29.  
 Matthewman, Joseph, Bradford, Maker up. Bradford. Pet June 5. Ord June 5. Exam June 29.  
 Midgley, Theophilus, Dewsbury, Yorks, Waste Merchant. Dewsbury. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 22.  
 Morton, John, Sheffield, Grocer. Sheffield. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam June 29 at 11.30.  
 Peader, Robert, Eastwood, Nottinghamshire, Engineer. Derby. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam July 19 at 10.  
 Poulter, Robert, High st, Peckham, Cab Proprietor. High Court. Pet May 4. Ord June 4. Exam July 19 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Ramshaw, Frederick Charles, Deanagat, Gt. Grimsby, Manager of Crocote Works. Gt. Grimsby. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 23 at 11 at Townhall, Gt. Grimsby.  
 Seamen, Thomas William, High st, Camden Town, Draper. High Court. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam July 13 at 12 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Shaw, Thomas, Colwyn Bay, Denbighshire, Physician. Bangor. Pet Apr 16. Ord June 7. Exam July 8 at 11 at Court house, Bangor.  
 Short, William Holland, Leeds, Coach Smith. Leeds. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 29 at 11.  
 Smith, Charles Henry, Gt. Grimsby, Hair Dresser. Gt. Grimsby. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam June 23 at 11 at Townhall, Grimsby.  
 Stanley, John, Lowestoft, Tailor. Gt. Yarmouth. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam July 21 at 11 at Townhall, Gt. Yarmouth.  
 Tingle, George William, Sheffield, Grocer. Sheffield. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam June 30 at 11.30.  
 Toen, John James, King William st, Watchmaker. High Court. Pet June 8. Ord June 8. Exam July 13 at 12 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Wilkinson, William, Harbort, Barmley, Joiner. Barmley. Pet June 7. Ord June 7. Exam June 24 at 11.30.  
 Williams, Evan, Llanengan, Carnarvonshire, Shoemaker. Bangor. Pet June 9. Ord June 9. Exam July 8 at Court house, Bangor.

Winfield, Thomas Newell, Dudley, Worcestershire, Grocer. Dudley. Pet May 15. Ord June 3. Exam June 21 at 11.

## FIRST MEETINGS.

Baker, Peter, Marmont rd, Peckham, Baker. June 18 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Benson, John Sharpley, Macclesfield, Commercial Traveller. June 22 at 12. Official Receiver, 23, King Edward st, Macclesfield.  
 Bradford, William, Sunderland, Grocer. June 18 at 2.30. Law Society, 32, John st, Sunderland.  
 Brewis, James Wilkinson, Newcastle on Tyne, Merchant's Clerk. June 21 at 2. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne.  
 Cheeseman, William Stookley, Grove rd, Brentford, out of business. June 21 at 11.30. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane.  
 Coward, James, Workington, Cumberland, Innkeeper. June 19 at 12. Official Receiver, 67, Duke st, Whitehaven.  
 Davies, Walter, Queen Victoria st, Tile Maker. June 23 at 1. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Deakin, William, Walsall, Corn Factor. June 21 at 4. Official Receiver, Bridge st, Walsall.  
 Eldershaw, Henry Newton, Congleton, Cheshire, Mill Owner. June 22 at 11. Official Receiver, 23, King Edward st, Macclesfield.  
 Embra, Thomas, Henley in Arden, Warwickshire, Baker. June 19 at 11.30. Messrs. Couchman and Son, Henley in Arden.  
 Etheridge, George, Otterbourne, Hampshire, Farmer. June 22 at 3. Official Receiver, 74, High st, Winchester.  
 Freeman, Thomas, West Bromwich, Staffordshire, Baker. June 28 at 10.30. Court house, Oldbury.  
 French, Thomas, Overbury st, Clapton Park, Builder. June 21 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Gambrell, Thomas Boys, Waltham, Kent, out of business. June 18 at 10. 32, St George's st, Canterbury.  
 Gerhold, Henry, Regent's Park, Cabinet Manufacturer. June 21 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Griffiths, Charles, Huddersfield, Draper. June 22 at 3. Messrs. Haigh and Son, New st, Huddersfield.  
 Harris, John Myer, Leadenhall st, Director of the Sulymah and Sherboro' Trading Co. June 23 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Henderson, James, Morpeth, Northumberland, Plumber. June 21 at 2.45. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne.  
 Irvine, William, Leathwell rd, Lewisham, Clerk. June 18 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Jones, William Lewis, Porth, Glamorganshire, Jeweller. June 18 at 12. Official Receiver, Morpeth Tyddal.  
 Kitchen, Edmund, Skelsmergh, nr Kendal, Farmer. June 23 at 3. Official Receiver, 37, Stramonsgate, Kendal.  
 Lambert, John, Fighting Cocks, Durham, Hotel Proprietor. June 23 at 11. Official Receiver, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough.  
 Leslie, Charles Radcliffe Aloysius, Slindon, Sussex, Gent. June 23 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Levy, Isaac, Haggerston rd, Haggerston, Licensed Victualler. June 21 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Loveys, James Isaac, Dawlish, Devon, Builder. June 21 at 11. Castle of Exeter, Exeter.  
 Luscombe, George, Bingley, Yorks, Pot Hawker. June 18 at 11. Official Receiver, 31, Manor row, Bradford.  
 Matthewman, Joseph, Bradford, Maker-up. June 18 at 10.30. Official Receiver, 31, Manor row, Bradford.  
 Mentha, Robert Gleave, Manchester, Merchant. June 24 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Gledens chhrs, Bridge st, Manchester.  
 Owens, David John, Pentre, Glamorganshire, Grocer. June 22 at 12. Court house, Pontypridd.  
 Paine, Charles Nathaniel, Lordship terr, Lordship lane, Dalwich, Baker. June 21 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Palliser, William, Doncaster rd, Barnsley, Wheelwright. June 24 at 10. Official Receiver, Eastgate, Barnsley.  
 Payne, John Christopher, and Frank White, East Retford, Notts, Auctioneers. June 24 at 12. Official Receiver, 2, St Benedict's sq, Lincoln.  
 Pugh, John Devereux, Wrexham, Denbighshire, Solicitor. June 22 at 2.30. Wynnstay Arms Hotel, Wrexham.  
 Roberts, George, Liverpool, Builder. June 25 at 3. Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool.  
 Royle, Mary, Monton, nr Worsley, Lancashire, Farmer. June 30 at 2.30. Court house, Encombe pl, Salford.  
 Saunders, George, Barreton, Kent, Farmer. June 18 at 10.30. 32, St George's st, Canterbury.  
 Scott, William, Newport, Mon, Boot Dealer. June 21 at 12. Official Receiver, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon.  
 Sheridan, Dudley Perrott, Lombard st, Financial Agent. June 23 at 2.30. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Shove, Francis Cobbett, London st, Greenwich, Corn Dealer. June 21 at 3. Official Receiver, 108, Victoria st, Westminster.  
 Slater, Edward, High st, Homerton, Bootmaker. June 23 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Smith, Allan Kincaid, Westbourne pk, Gent. June 25 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Smith, Charles Henry, Tothill st, Westminster, Surveyor. June 21 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.  
 Thorburn, William, Newport, Mon, Draper. June 21 at 11. Official Receiver, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon.  
 Wilcocks, Nathaniel George, Bath, Soda Water Machinist. June 18 at 12.30. Official Receiver, Bank chhrs, Bristol.  
 Winfield, Thomas Newell, Dudley, Worcestershire, Grocer. June 22 at 10.45. Official Receiver, Dudley.  
 Winsby, John, Leyburn, Yorks, Innkeeper. June 21 at 12.30. Court house, Northallerton.  
 Wright, Henry Townley, Commander of gunboat "Gaymandah," at Brisbane. June 22 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.

## ADJUDICATIONS.

Bell, George, Wallsend, Northumberland, Grocer. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet May 25. Ord June 8.  
 Bird, Thomas, Great Bridge, Staffordshire, Beerhouse Keeper. Oldbury. Pet June 2. Ord June 5.  
 Cheeseman, William Stookley, Grove rd, Brentford, out of business. Brentford. Pet May 27. Ord June 9.  
 Chilwell, John Livermore, Polesworth, Warwickshire, Farmer. Birmingham. Pet June 7. Ord June 8.  
 Cornelius, Albert, Dawlish, Devon, Shoemaker. Exeter. Pet May 25. Ord June 9.  
 Coward, James, Workington, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Cockermouth and Workington. Pet June 3. Ord June 8.  
 Davies, Edward, Saint Nicholas, Glamorganshire, Wheelwright. Cardiff. Pet June 2. Ord June 5.  
 Davies, Thomas Harris, Cardiff, Tailor. Cardiff. Pet May 7. Ord June 5.  
 Dicken, Samuel, Sedgley, Staffordshire, Cabinetmaker. Wolverhampton. Pet June 7. Ord June 8.  
 Douglas, Mary Ann, and John Norman Douglas, Penrith, Cumberland, Saddlers. Carlisle. Pet May 24. Ord June 7.  
 Drummond, John Edward, Cross st, Great Sutton st, Clerkenwell, Lamp Manufacturer. High Court. Pet May 12. Ord June 9.





**Prints, David, Blaenarw, nr Bridgend, Grocer. Cardiff. Pet June 8. Ord June 10.**  
**Port, Alfred Charles, Cheltenham, Colonel. Cheltenham. Pet May 25. Ord June 10.**  
**Francis, Henry, Newport, Hampshire, Merchant. High Court. Pet Apr 21. Ord June 9.**  
**Hancock, William Edward, Newport, Mon, Brewer's Traveller. Newport, Mon. Pet June 11. Ord June 11.**  
**Harrison, Henry, Selly Oak, Worcestershire, Cabinet Maker. Birmingham. Pet May 18. Ord June 11.**  
**Hill, Henry, Ashton on Mersey, Cheshire, Salesman. Manchester. Pet June 11. Ord June 11.**  
**Holly, Arthur Augustus, Southsea, Grocer. Portsmouth. Pet June 9. Ord June 9.**  
**Jones, Thomas, Mochmant, Denbighshire, Grocer. Newtown. Pet May 15. Ord June 11.**  
**Lewis, Joseph, Alford, Lincolnshire, Gunsmith. Boston. Pet June 10. Ord June 10.**  
**Lindsay, James Henry Cox, Liverpool, Metal Merchant. Liverpool. Pet June 11. Ord June 11.**  
**Palliser, William, Doncaster rd, Barnsley, Wheelwright. Barnsley. Pet June 4. Ord June 10.**  
**Rostron, Henry, Bolton, Lancashire, Fish Dealer. Bolton. Pet June 11. Ord June 11.**  
**Russell, Alfred Holgate, and Arthur Wellesley Russell, Liverpool, Watch Manufacturers. Liverpool. Pet June 9. Ord June 10.**  
**Thomas, James, Manorbier, Pembrokeshire, Farmer. Pembrokeshire. Pet May 21. Ord June 11.**  
**Vickers, Henry, Uffculme, Devon, Farmer. Exeter. Pet June 10. Ord June 11.**  
**Winfield, Thomas Newel, Dudley, Worcestershire, Grocer. Dudley. Pet May 18. Ord June 10.**

**ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.**  
**Pierce, Arthur Charles, Liverpool, Grocer. Liverpool. Adjud Feb 11. Annul June 11.**

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—*Town, 28s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s.* Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—*cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.*

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	545	Whittingstall v. Grover .....	550
THE COUNTY COURTS ACT CONSOLIDATION BILL .....	546	Colls v. Robbins .....	550
THE EVIDENCE TAKEN BY THE CHANCERY CHAMBERS COMMITTEE .....	547	Crawford v. Crawford and Dilke .....	551
REVIEWS .....	548	CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS:—	
CORRESPONDENCE .....	548	Re C. J. L. Gray (a Solicitor), Ex parte Everitt .....	551
CASES OF LAST WEEK:—		THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEES ON CHANCERY BUSINESS .....	552
COURT OF APPEAL:—		LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL .....	553
Pooley v. Whetham .....	548	OBITUARY .....	553
Howarth v. Howarth .....	548	LEGAL APPOINTMENTS .....	553
The Lydney and Wigpool Iron Ore Co., Limited v. Bird .....	549	COURT PAPERS .....	553
Thomas v. Turner .....	549	COMPANIES .....	554
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE:—		CREDITORS' CLAIMS .....	554
Re Vaughan, Vaughan v. Thomas .....	550	LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c. ....	557

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

## SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.  
 Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.  
 Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is *REALLY CHEAPER* than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.  
 COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.  
 In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietor,  
 H. SCHWEITZER & Co., 10, Adam-st., Strand, London, W.C.

## EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS,

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTER

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY &amp; CLERGY GOWNS

ESTABLISHED 1860.

24, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

UNTEARABLE LETTER  
COPYING BOOKS.

HOWARD'S PATENT.

Stronger and more durable than any other  
 Letter Copying Books now made.

THE COPYING BOOK FOR THE PROFESSION  
 PRICE LIST UPON APPLICATION.

WODDERSPOON &amp; CO.,

7, SERLE STREET, AND 1, PORTUGAL STREET  
 LINCOLN'S INN, W.C.

## SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION,

For the Relief of Poor and Necessitous Attorneys, Solicitors, and Proctors in England and Wales, and their Wives,  
 Widows, and Families.

INSTITUTED 1858.

## THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL

OF THIS ASSOCIATION WILL BE HELD AT

"THE ALBION," ALDERSGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.,

On WEDNESDAY, the 30th of JUNE, 1886, at Seven o'clock p.m. precisely.

GEORGE BURROW GREGORY, Esq., M.P., in the Chair.

List of Stewards, who will be glad to receive Subscriptions and Donations for announcement at the Festival.

G. BEETHAM BATCHELOR, Esq., London.  
 MR. UNDER-SHERIFF WYNNE BAXTER, London.  
 C. STOCKDALE BENNING, Esq., Dunstable.  
 CHARLES J. BLAGG, Esq., Chesham.  
 WM. FRANK BLANDY, Esq., Reading.  
 A. P. BOWER, Esq., London.  
 W. BERRIAH BROOK, Esq., London.  
 GEO. RODDAM BURN, Esq., London.  
 S. J. CHADWICK, Esq., Dewsbury.  
 CHARLES CHESTON, Esq., M.A., London.  
 HENRY CLEVELAND, Esq., London.  
 FREDK. COBBETT, Esq., Worcester.  
 JOHN DARLINGTON, Esq., K.L., K.C.I., Bradford.  
 WILLIAM DAWES, Esq., Rye.  
 H. W. DICKINSON, Esq., Poole.  
 GRANTHAM R. DODD, Esq., London.  
 LEWIS EMANUEL, Esq., London.  
 HENRY J. FRANCIS, Esq., London.  
 JOHN E. T. GRAHAM, Esq., Scarborough.  
 JOHN GREENFIELD, Esq., London.

SAMUEL HARRIS, Esq., Leicester.  
 EDWIN HEDGER, Esq., London.  
 J. WARREN HOWLETT, Esq., Brighton.  
 JOHN HY. KAYS, Esq., London.  
 HENRY KIMBER, Esq., M.P., London.  
 J. E. S. KING, Esq., London.  
 WM. KEARY, Esq., Stoke-on-Trent.  
 GRINHAM KEEN, Esq., London.  
 CHARLES E. LEWIS, Esq., M.P.  
 WALTER LOVELL, Esq., Cambridge.  
 EDWIN LOW, Esq., London.  
 C. B. MARGETT, Esq., Huntingdon.  
 F. PARKER MORRELL, Esq., Oxford.  
 W. BENJAMIN PATERSON, Esq., London.  
 RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq., London.  
 RICHARD PIDCOCK, Esq., Woolwich.  
 T. J. PITFIELD, Esq., London.  
 JOSEPH PLASKITT, Esq., London.  
 DONALD W. PRESTON, Esq., Bournemouth.  
 THOMAS RAWLE, Esq., London.  
 A. C. RAWLINSON, Esq., Chipping Norton.  
 SIR A. KAYE ROLLIT, LL.D., D.C.L., London.

HENRY ROSCOE, Esq., London.  
 J. ANDERSON ROSE, Esq., London.  
 EDWARD LEE ROWCLIFFE, Esq., London.  
 WILLIAM ROWCLIFFE, Esq., London.  
 HERBERT T. SANKEY, Esq., Canterbury.  
 FREDK. E. SAWYER, Esq., F.S.A., Brighton.  
 W. EDWOOD SHIRLEY, Esq., Doncaster.  
 T. SKEWES-COX, Esq., London.  
 SIDNEY SMITH, Esq., London.  
 HENRY SOWTON, Esq., London.  
 W. HENRY STALLAN, Esq., Chatham.  
 A. F. W. STEPHENS, Esq., Chatham.  
 FRANK W. STONE, Esq., Tunbridge Wells.  
 EDWIN T. TADMAN, Esq., London.  
 HENRY W. TRINDER, Esq., London.  
 R. WALL WALL, Esq., London.  
 W. MELMOTH WALTERS, Esq., London.  
 HENRY S. WASBROUGH, Esq., Bristol.  
 E. M. WAYELL, Esq., Halifax.  
 J. HARDY WELSBY, Esq., Southampton.  
 G. BRASH WHEELER, Esq., London.  
 SPENCER WHITEHEAD, Esq., London.

The Secretary will be happy to hear from gentlemen who may desire to add their names to the above list of Stewards.  
 Early application for Dinner Tickets (25s. each), which may be obtained of any of the Stewards, or at the office of the Association, will oblige.

9, CLIFFORD'S INN, LONDON, E.C.

JAMES THOMAS SCOTT, Secretary.

Telephone No. 1,669. Telegraphic address, "Akaber, London."—Sales for the Year 1886.

**MESSRS. BAKER & SONS** beg to announce that their SALES of LANDED ESTATES, Investments, Town, Suburban, and Country Houses, Business Premises, Building Land, Ground Rents, Reversions, Shares, and other Properties, will be held at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., as follows:—

Friday, June 18	Friday, Aug. 13	Friday, Oct. 29
Friday, June 25	Friday, Sept. 3	Friday, Nov. 5
Friday, July 9	Friday, Sept. 17	Friday, Nov. 19
Friday, July 16	Friday, Oct. 8	Friday, Dec. 10
Friday, July 23	Friday, Oct. 15	

Auctions can be held on other days besides those above specified.—No. 11, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.

By direction of Trustees and others.—Edgware-road, Harlesden, Edgware, and Harrow-road.

**MESSRS. BAKER & SONS** will SELL by AUCTION the following FREEHOLD PROPERTIES:—

At the Mart, on Friday, June 25, at 2.

**EDGWARE-ROAD.**—Freehold Stud or Dairy Farm, comprising residence, homestead, and 37 acres of meadow land, known as Redhill Farm, about 15 minutes from both Hendon and Edgware Stations, and having extensive frontages to the main Edgware-road and Stag-lane; with possession. —Vendors' Solicitors, Messrs. Bowker, Peak, Bird, & Collins, 6, Bedford-row, W.C.

**HARLESDEN, Middlesex.**—In Four Lots.—Long Leasehold Dwelling-houses, producing £153 per annum. Unexpired term 78 years, at moderate ground-rents.—Vendors' Solicitor, J. Wright, Esq., 57, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.C.

**EDGWARE, Middlesex.**—By direction of the Executors of the late William Field, Esq.—In One Lot.—Freehold and Copyhold Meadow Land, containing about 8½ acres. Two minutes from Edgware Station, with frontage to Church-lane.—Vendors' Solicitors, Messrs. Garrard, James, & Wolfe, 13, Suffolk-street, Pall-mall East, S.W.

**HARROW-ROAD, Kenal-green.**—Freehold Property, known as the Park House Coffee Tavern, with Possession.—Vendors' Solicitor, F. O. Edlin, Esq., 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

Particulars at the Mart; of the respective Solicitors; and of the Auctioneers, 11, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.

#### ON FRIDAY NEXT.

Valuable Shares.—Absolutely without Reserve.

**MESSRS. BAKER & SONS** will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on FRIDAY NEXT, the 25th JUNE, in Lots, 50 £10 SHARES, fully paid up, in the NATIONAL STANDARD LAND MORTGAGE and INVESTMENT COMPANY, Limited. A dividend of six per cent. per annum has regularly been declared on the Company's shares; they therefore offer an excellent investment.

Particulars of Messrs. Weall & Barker, Solicitors, 5, Bell-yard, Doctors'-commons, E.C.; and of the Auctioneers, 11, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.

#### ON FRIDAY NEXT.

By direction of the Executors of the late H. B. Beddome, Esq.—Valuable Shares in the Law Life Assurance Society.

**MESSRS. BAKER & SONS** will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on FRIDAY NEXT, JUNE 25, at TWO o'clock, in 10 Lots, TWENTY £100 SHARES in the LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY. The dividends average about 4½ per cent., with a quinquennial bonus, which brings up the average annual dividend to about 6½ per cent. To members of the legal profession (by whom only the shares can be held) they offer a thoroughly sound and improving investment.

Particulars and conditions of sale of Messrs. Riddale & Son, Solicitors, 5, Gray's-inn-square, W.C.; and of the Auctioneers, 11, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.

**MESSRS. JOHNSON & DYMOND** beg to announce that their Sales by Auction of Plate, Watches, Chains, Jewellery, Precious Stones, &c., are held on Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays.

The attention of Solicitors, Executors, Trustees, and others is particularly called to this ready means for the disposal of Property of deceased and other clients.

In consequence of the frequency of their sales Messrs. J. & D. are enabled to include large or small quantities at short notice (if required).

Sales of Furniture held at private houses. Valuations for Probate or Transfer. Terms on application to the City Auction Rooms (established 1793), 26 and 28, Gracechurch-street, E.C.

Messrs. Johnson & Dymond beg to notify that their Auction Sales of Wearing Apparel, Piece Goods, Household and Office Furniture, Carpets, Bedding, &c., are held on each day of the week (Saturday excepted).

#### SALES BY AUCTION FOR THE YEAR 1886.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER** beg to announce that their SALES of LANDED ESTATES, Investments, Town, Suburban, and Country Houses, Business Premises, Building Land, Ground-rents, Advowsons, Reversions, Stocks, Shares, and other Properties, will be held at the Auction Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, near the Bank of England, in the City of London, as follows:—

Tues., June 22	Tues., Aug 3	Tues., Oct 5
Tues., June 29	Tues., Aug 10	Tues., Oct 19
Tues., July 6	Tues., Aug 17	Tues., Nov 9
Tues., July 13	Tues., Aug 24	Tues., Nov 23
Tues., July 20	Tues., Aug 31	Tues., Dec 14
Tues., July 27		

Auctions can also be held on other days. In order to insure proper publicity, due notice should be given. The period between such notice and the proposed auction must considerably depend upon the nature of the property to be sold. A printed scale of terms can be had at their offices, 80, Cheapside, London, or will be forwarded by post.

#### CITY OF LONDON.

Investments of the highest class.—Freehold Ground-rents amounting to £1,950 per annum, thoroughly well secured upon important business premises occupying a fine situation within a few doors of the Bank of England, abutting upon the Stock Exchange, and in the centre of the most valuable part of the City of London.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER** will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, JULY 13, at TWO, in Three Lots, the following important FREEHOLD PROPERTIES, viz.:—

Lot 1.—A Freehold Ground-rent of £1,250 per annum, amply secured upon No. 56, Threadneedle-street, modern business premises, possessing a frontage of about 20ft. 6in. to Threadneedle-street, and embracing an area of about 1,000 square feet. Let on lease at the above rent until Christmas, 1899, when the purchaser will be entitled to the full rack rental.

Lot 2.—A Freehold Ground-rent of £300 per annum, amply secured upon No. 54, Threadneedle-street, business premises possessing frontages, (including the portion extending over Hercules-passage) of about 20ft. 5in. to Threadneedle-street and 29ft. to Hercules-passage, one of the principal entrances to the Stock Exchange, and embracing a first-floor area of about 505 square feet. The purchaser will be entitled to the ground-rent until the expiry of the lease at Christmas, 1921, and then to the full rack rental.

Lot 3.—A Freehold Ground-rent of £400 per annum, amply secured upon No. 82, Old Broad-street, business premises, possessing frontages of about 21ft. to Old Broad-street and 45ft. 5in. to Hercules-passage and embracing an area of about 819 square feet. Let on lease at the above rent until Michaelmas, 1921, when the purchaser will be entitled to the full rack rental.

Particulars, with plans, of Messrs. Boodle & Co., 53, Davies-street, Berkeley-square; and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER** LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for three stamps. Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

#### REIGATE, SURREY.

Important Freehold Estate, known as "The Dingle," situated near to Wray-common, only a short distance from the railway station, 1½ miles from Red Hill Junction Station, and within 40 minutes' ride of London, one of the choicest properties in this picturesque and healthy district. The grounds are of great natural beauty, and comprise miniature park, with charming shrubberies and plantations, meadow land, good gardens and orchards, pleasure grounds, with 2 rustic summer-houses, lawn, and parterre, with tennis court, whilst pleasantly shady walks are formed through a pretty dell which runs through the property, the whole embellished with choice specimen and forest trees. The residence is commodious, and was erected by the late owner for his own occupation. It is well built of brick, with stone dressings and slated roof, and contains 4 handsome reception rooms, 11 bed rooms, bath rooms, dressing rooms, conservatory, and offices. There are also entrance lodge, coachman's house, stabling, small farmery, large swimming bath, bath-house, with dressing rooms, the whole property being in complete and decorative repair, and embracing an area of 134 acres. With possession. To be SOLD by AUCTION by

**M. R. JOHN LEES, at the MART, London, on WEDNESDAY, 23rd JUNE, at TWO o'clock,** by direction of the Trustees of the late Joseph Crossfield, offering a rare opportunity of acquiring a beautiful RESIDENTIAL ESTATE in this locality.

Particulars may be obtained of Messrs. Munns & Longden, Solicitors, 8, Old Jewry, London, E.C.; and of Mr. John Lees, Auctioneer, Reigate, and 17, Wool Exchange, London, E.C., of whom alone orders to view may be obtained.

**HAMPSTEAD HEATH and REGENT'S PARK.** By order of the Executors of Richard Bright, Esq., deceased.

**MESSRS. S. WALKER & BUNTZ** will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on MONDAY, JUNE 28, at TWO, in Three Lots, the following desirable PROPERTIES, viz.:—

**HAMPSTEAD HEATH.**—A most attractive Freehold Residence, with an acre of pleasure grounds, beautifully placed, and known as Myrtle Lodge, North-end, Hampstead, containing six capital bed rooms, bath room, elegant double drawing room, communicating with conservatory, 27ft. 6in. in length, dining and morning rooms with bay windows, excellent domestic offices, and cellars; kitchen garden, stabling, coach-house, harness room, greenhouse, &c.; the property has a private gate directly on to the most secluded part of the Heath; let on lease for a term expiring Michaelmas, 1898, at £210 per annum, but possession at an earlier date can be arranged.

**REGENT'S PARK (on the Portland Estate).**—Two superior Detached Residences, being:—  
No. 27, AVENUE-ROAD, containing four bed rooms, handsome drawing and dining rooms, morning room, conservatory, and commodious domestic offices; capital garden with full-sized tennis-court, stabling for two horses, coach-house; held for an unexpired term of 18½ years at a peppercorn, and let on repairing lease expiring Sept., 1899, at a rent of £105 per annum.

No. 35, AVENUE-ROAD, contains seven bed and dressing rooms, elegant drawing room, dining and morning rooms, commodious domestic offices; good gardens, both front and rear; unexpired term of 18½ years, at a peppercorn, and let on repairing lease, expiring March, 1891, at £110 per annum.

Particulars may be had at the Jack Straw's Castle, Hampstead-heath, of Messrs. Walls, Abbott, & Martin, Solicitors, 11, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.; at the Mart; and at the Auctioneers' Offices, 22, Moorgate-street, E.C.

**SURREY HILLS.**—Exceedingly attractive Freehold Estate of 113 acres, between Croydon and Redhill, with a commodious modern Elizabethan Residence, and adjuncts of a high-class country house, 19 bed and 3 dressing rooms, 3 bath rooms, boudoir, 2 staircases, 4 good reception rooms, billiard room, and offices; stabling for 11 horses, coachman's cottage, rooms for grooms, gardeners, &c.; picturesque, well timbered pleasure grounds with lodge, kitchen and fruit gardens, orchard, glasshouses, capital modern house for head gardener, cottages, laundry, farmery, bailiffs' cottages, buildings, and undulating park land, with grand old timber. To be Sold, Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER, 80, Cheapside.

**MESSRS. PUTTICK & SIMPSON, Literary and Fine Art Auctioneers, 47, Leicester-square, London, W.C.,** beg to inform Executors, Trustees, Solicitors, and the Trade, that their Season for the disposal by Auction of Libraries of Books and Manuscripts, Engravings, Paintings, and other works connected with the Fine Arts, Musical Instruments, and all descriptions of Valuable Property, will commence on October 17, and that their warehouses are open daily for the reception of goods consigned to them for sale. Messrs. P. & S. will hold several important Sales during the season, and will include small properties in appropriate Sales, thus affording the same advantages to small as to large consignments. Libraries and other properties catalogued, arranged, and valued for Probate and Legacy Duty, or for Public or Private Sale.

#### TO ALL INVESTORS.

**THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.**—Established over 60 years ago—possesses Invested Funds to the amount of £1,000,000 Sterling, and has an Annual Revenue of £900,000. Policies granted for large or small sums, making provision for retirement in old age or death. Annuities also granted on favourable terms. London: 83, King William-street, E.C., and 3, Pall Mall East, S.W.

**NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY.**

Established 1836. LONDON: 1, Moorgate-street, E.C. AMSTERDAM: 1, Union-terrace.

INCOME & FUNDS (1885):—	
Fire Premiums	£577,000
Life Premiums	191,000
Interest	135,000
Accumulated Funds	£3,134,000

**REVERSIONARY and LIFE INTERESTS IN LANDED or FUNDED PROPERTY** or other Securities and Annuities PURCHASED, or Loans or Annuities thereon granted, by the **EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY (LIMITED)**, 14, Lancaster-place, Waterloo-bridge, Strand. Established 1835. Capital, £200,000. Interest on Loans may be capitalized.

F. S. CLAYTON, Joint O. H. CLAYTON, Secretaries

**LONDON.—SHIRLEY'S TEMPERANCE HOTEL, 37, Queen's-square, Bloomsbury, W.C.**—Beds, 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d.; plain breakfast or tea, 1s. 3d. This old-established House is most centrally situated about midway between the City and West-end, near to the chief railway-stations and places of amusement, within five minutes' walk of great thoroughfares and lines of omnibuses, and, being in a square, is very quiet and open. The house is most home-like, and highly-satisfactory testimonials may be had on application.